

# The Classical Review

AUGUST 1909

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

EURIPIDES, *HELENA* 962-974.

THE situation is this. Helen has been committed to the protection of the good Proteus, king of Egypt. By the death of Proteus, his obligations have devolved upon his daughter Theonoe. A claim for the restoration of Helen is now made by her husband Menelaus, who, in the course of his plea, speaks as follows:

969 ὦ νέρτερ' Αἰδη, καὶ σὲ σύμμαχον καλῶ,  
ὅς πολλ' ἐδέξω τῆσδ', ἔκατι σώματα  
πесόντα τῷμ' φασγάνῳ, μισθὸν δ' ἔχεις·  
ἢ νῦν ἐκείνους ἀπόδος ἐμφύχους πάλιν,  
ἢ τήνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γε τεύσεβους πατρὸς  
κρείσσω φανείσιν ἀμ' ἀποδοῦναι λέχηϊ.

The god of the nether world, who has profited (such is the argument) by the many dead, whom Menelaus has sent to him for the sake of Helen, is called upon either to give back these dead, as a payment not earned, or else now to make repayment, by compelling Theonoe to restore Helen to her husband.

The last two verses have no metre. But the attempts to mend them, by repairing the metre only, are useless. The sense is equally defective. Hades is to *compel* Theonoe to restore Helen. But how is he to do this? What power or function in the matter has the god of the nether world? This is what the concluding verses, in their genuine form, must explain. And upon consideration, it

NO. CCIII. VOL. XXIII.

seems that between Hades and the office proposed to him there is but one possible link. To control and compel Theonoe, *he must release, for the moment, her father Proteus*. Proteus, if he could return and appear, would of course be master of the situation. His authority would displace that of his heiress (ἢ νῦν κυρία, v. 968), and he could deal as he pleased with the deposit (Helen) entrusted to himself. But Proteus cannot appear except by permission of Hades, and this it is which Menelaus demands:

ἢ τήνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γε, πατρὸς εὔσεβους  
κρείσσω γ' ἀνείς φαντάσματ', ἀποδοῦναι λέχη,

'Or else *compel* Theonoe to restore my wife, by sending up, to *control* her, the apparition of her pious father.' For the use of ἀνέναι in this connexion, see Liddell and Scott s.v. The important words ἀνάγκασον and κρείσσω (*superior*, to the daughter) are thus each enforced by γε. Other arrangements, with the same sense, are possible, e.g.

ἢ τήνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γ' ἔμ' ἀποδοῦναι λέχη,  
κρείσσω γ' ἀνείς φάσματ' εὔσεβους πατρός.

But the first seems on the whole the most probable, and, as will be seen, a slight confusion in the letters γανεισφαν would account for the actual tradition.

Thus explained, the passage continues naturally the sense of the preceding (962 ff.),

K

in which Menelaus appeals directly to the deceased Proteus, but adds that, being dead, he *can now act only through his daughter* and representative. The connexion of thought thus indicated may perhaps throw light upon the defective verse 965,

οἶδ' οὐνεχ' ἡμῖν οὐποτ' † ἀπολέσεις † θανών.

Here ἀπολέσεις is nonsense, and nothing satisfactory has been suggested. Possibly the lost word signified, not 'you will restore (Helen)' or the like, but 'you will *return*.'

'I know that, being dead, you cannot come back to us,' would be appropriate to the context, and would be given by ἀπονίσσῃ (or -ει), whether taken as a present or as a future—a point upon which the ancients differed. Or ἀπονοστεῖς would give the same. This would afford a natural, though not necessary, lead for the subsequent appeal to Hades and the request that he will, for this occasion, make possible the impossible, and permit the return of the deceased.

A. W. VERRALL.

#### THE EXPRESSIONS ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος AND ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε IN THUCYDIDES.

##### *Preface.*

THE following article raises a question which is certainly interesting, and may possibly be regarded as important, with reference to the exact interpretation of the pronoun ὅδε in a number of passages in Thucydides. It is a question which has been much discussed, especially by German writers who have dealt with the order of the composition of various parts of Thucydides' work; but so far as I am aware, none of them has come to the conclusion at which I have arrived by comparison of the passages to which reference is made. The article has therefore, I believe, the merit of originality; whether it also possesses the merit of truth or probable truth must be decided by those who care to examine the arguments contained in it.

I myself approached the question from the historical point of view, and for the historical rather than the linguistic purpose; but I found it quite insoluble on purely historical lines, and was therefore obliged to consider the data from a point of view more linguistic than that of others who have written upon the subject. The conclusions may therefore be interesting to the pure scholar as well as to the historian.

For those to whom the subject may seem of interest, but who are unacquainted with the main lines of the criticism of the composition of Thucydides' history, I may say

briefly that the historical importance of these passages is as follows:

- (1) It has been argued that the first half of Thucydides' history (i. 1-v. 25) was *originally* written as a history of the 'Ten Years' War (431-421), in the years subsequent to the Peace of Nikias (421), that is to say before the Dekelean War, and possibly even before the Sicilian Expedition, began.
- (2) It has been further argued that this is evidenced, *inter alia*, by the existence in this first half of the work of passages which cannot have been written at a time when the author had the *whole* Peloponnesian War in view, because they would be obviously untrue if applied to the whole twenty-seven years of war.
- (3) Many of the most important of these passages contain the expressions which I propose to discuss in this article.

I may confess that I am a convinced adherent of the general argument stated in (1); but it will be seen later that, as far as the passages to which reference is made in (2) and (3), I do not feel that those which contain the expression ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε can be used as arguments in favour of this general theory in which, on other grounds, I have faith.

To enter into all the arguments which have been employed with reference to those

passages would necessitate the writing of a preface much longer than this article which it prefaces. I shall therefore confine myself to one or two selected examples.

Ullrich argues with reference to the passages iii. 98 (οἱ . . . διεφθάρησαν) and iii. 113 (πάθος . . . ἐγένετο), in both of which the expression ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε is used, that Thucydides would not have spoken so strongly in these passages had he known at the time of the greater events of the second war (cf. vii. 28. ὅσῳ καὶ μείζων ὁ πόλεμος ἦν), and especially of those referred to viii. 29 and 30, vii. 57, viii. 96.

If my interpretation of ὅδε after πόλεμος in Thucydides be right, Thucydides might have written those passages, even had he known of the events of the later parts of the whole war. In other words I believe ὅδε in this passage to be far more precise and limitative in meaning than Ullrich assumed it to be.

Herbst, a conservative and therefore anti-Ullrichian critic, after considering various passages in which this expression occurs, is inclined to come to the general conclusion that ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος refers to the Twenty-Seven Years' War, while ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε refers to the Ten Years' War. (v. his article in *Philologus* 38.)

My conclusion approximates more closely to his than to Ullrich's, but differs from it in certain essential and very important features.

Any student of Thucydides must notice at an early stage of his study of the author's work that the demonstrative adjective ὅδε when used with the word πόλεμος sometimes precedes and sometimes follows that noun. Furthermore, an examination of the passages in which these two varieties of expression occur will probably raise the suspicion that this variation is not a mere question of taste in the order of words in some particular context, but implies a difference of meaning in the demonstrative adjective. Even at the risk of anticipating the discussion it may be said that it seems almost certain that such a difference of meaning *does* exist. The difficulty is to determine wherein that difference lies. The question is one which

has been much discussed by modern critics, without, however, any agreement on the subject having been arrived at.

Before entering upon any detailed discussion of the question, there are certain general considerations which must be taken into account.

The contrast between the frequency with which Thucydides uses the demonstrative adjective ὅδε in connection with πόλεμος and the rarity with which he uses the adjective ὁδτος with that noun is very striking. The latter is only found in three instances, in one of which it precedes, and in two of which it follows the noun;<sup>1</sup> whereas the former occurs in thirty-six cases, in fifteen of which it precedes, and in twenty-one of which it follows the noun.<sup>2</sup> In the cases of the use of ὁδτος, there is in vii. 85 an express reference by name to the Sicilian War;<sup>3</sup> the other two might refer, judged by themselves, to either the Ten Years' or the Twenty-Seven Years' War, though both probably refer to the Ten Years' War.<sup>4</sup> The second noticeable point is with regard to the use of ὅδε alone. In the First Book it invariably precedes the noun πόλεμος. The same order is found in the earlier chapters of the Second Book (16, 21, 34).

<sup>1</sup> i. 23 (preceding); i. 21 and vii. 85 (following).

<sup>2</sup> Cases in which it precedes are found: i. 8, 13, 18, 23, 24, 97, 118 (3 times); ii. 16, 21, 34; vi. 17; vii. 44, 56. Cases in which it follows are found: ii. 47, 70, 103; iii. 25, 54, 88, 98, 113, 116; iv. 48, 51, 133, 135; v. 20 (twice); vi. 7, 93; vii. 18; viii. 6, 60, 87.

<sup>3</sup> ἐν τῷ Συκελικῷ πολέμῳ τούτῳ.

<sup>4</sup> I have called attention to this contrast between the frequency of the use ὅδε and the rarity of the use of ὁδτος because it is so striking a peculiarity in the author's composition. But I have not made up my mind as to what conclusion is to be drawn therefrom. I cannot believe that it is simply due to a mere personal preference for the one form of the distinguishing adjective over the other, because, in point of fact, ὁδτος is far more common than ὅδε in the general text of Thucydides. I believe it to be deliberate in a significant sense, but I confess I am unable to make any satisfactory suggestion as to where the significance lies. One negative fact is certain: that the common distinction between ὁδτος as referring to previous and ὅδε as referring to subsequent matter, though marked in other parts of Thucydides, does not hold good in these phrases.

In ii. 47 it is used for the first time in marking the close of a year of the war; and there, as is invariably the case in Thucydides where *ὅδε* is used in this connection, it follows the noun. But the curious thing is that from this point onward to the end of the first half of the history in v. 25, *ὅδε* invariably succeeds the noun *πόλεμος*, whether it be used in speaking of the termination of a year of the war,<sup>1</sup> or in some other connection.<sup>2</sup> Thus the usage in the first part of the first half of the history is distinct from that in the second part of the same half.

In the second half of the history both positions of *ὅδε* are found. In recording the terminations of the years of the war, whenever used, it comes after the noun, as in the first half of the history.<sup>3</sup> In one other case it also comes after the noun.<sup>4</sup> In three cases it comes before the noun,<sup>5</sup> but none of these three have reference to the end of a year of the war.

With respect to its use in dating the ends of years of the wars certain peculiarities are noticeable. The tendency of the author is to employ a set formula. The formula most commonly employed is: *καὶ* (ordinal number) *ἔτος τῷ πολέμῳ ἐτελεύτα τῷδε ὃν Θουκυδίδης ξυνέγραψεν*. This is found in ten out of the nineteen instances of this form of dating in Thucydides' work.<sup>6</sup>

A slight and apparently unimportant variant of this formula, *καὶ* (ordinal number) *ἔτος ἐτελεύτα τῷ πολέμῳ τῷδε ὃν Θουκυδίδης ξυνέγραψεν*, is found in two instances.<sup>7</sup> In one instance an abbreviated form is used—(ordinal number) *ἔτος τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐτελεύτα*.<sup>8</sup> In the remaining six instances of the dating of the end of a year of the war the adjective *ὅδε* is not used,<sup>9</sup> and the formula employed is *καὶ* (ordinal number) *ἔτος τῷ πολέμῳ ἐτελεύτα* in five of the six passages,<sup>10</sup> and in the sixth a slight variant, namely (ordinal number) *ἔτος ἐτελεύτα τῷ πολέμῳ*.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As in ii. 47, 70, 103; iii. 25, 88, 116; iv. 51, 135.

<sup>2</sup> As in iii. 54, 98, 113; iv. 48; v. 20 (twice).

<sup>3</sup> vi. 7, 93; vii. 18; viii. 6, 60. <sup>4</sup> vii. 87.

<sup>5</sup> vi. 17; vii. 44, 56.

<sup>6</sup> ii. 103; iii. 25, 88, 116; iv. 51, 135; vi. 93; vii. 18; viii. 6, 60.

<sup>7</sup> ii. 70; vi. 7.

<sup>8</sup> iv. 116; v. 39, 51, 56, 81, 83.

<sup>10</sup> Viz., those in Book V.

<sup>9</sup> ii. 47.

<sup>11</sup> iv. 116.

It thus appears that, ignoring the slight variation referred to above, the full formula is employed throughout the history of the Ten Years' War, with one exception,<sup>12</sup> and also throughout the history of the Sicilian expedition and that part of the narrative of the Dekelean War which Thucydides lived to write. In the Fifth Book (and once in the latter part of the Fourth Book) an abbreviated and less precisely worded formula is used, in which the word *ὅδε* does not occur.

Summing up, therefore, what has been already said, the general peculiarities which are noticeable with regard to the use of *ὅδε* with *πόλεμος* are as follows:

(1) Its frequency as compared with the use of *ὅστος*:

(2) That in the first half of the history, i.e. as far as v. 25, *ὅδε*, when used with *πόλεμος*, always precedes that noun in the text up to the thirty-fifth chapter of the Second Book; whereas from the forty-seventh chapter of the Second Book up to the end of this first half of the history, it invariably follows that noun.

It is also remarkable that the instance in the forty-seventh chapter of the Second Book is the first case in which it is used in dating the end of a year of the war.

(3) That wherever *ὅδε* is used in dating the end of a year of the war, it always follows the noun.

(4) That *ὅδε* is always employed in this form of dating, *except in the Fifth Book* and in one passage of the Fourth Book.

It is impossible to suppose that these peculiarities are accidental.

Ullrich was *disposed* to regard the earlier references in the first half of the work, those in which *ὅδε* precedes the noun, as applicable to the Ten Years' War, and the later ones, in which it follows the noun, as applicable to the war as a whole. But as a fact the earlier series of references are, *in themselves*, quite indeterminate; and, though they *probably* refer for the most part to the Ten Years' War, yet those in i. 97 and i. 118 probably refer to the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

In one passage (ii. 54) *ὅδε* refers almost certainly to the Ten Years' War; but then

<sup>12</sup> iv. 116.

the word *πόλεμος* does not appear, so that no conclusion can be drawn as to the significance before and after the noun.<sup>1</sup>

It has, however, been already pointed out that the passages referring to the close of the years of the war which do not contain the word *ὅδε* occur, with the one exception in the one hundred and sixteenth chapter of the Fourth Book, in the Fifth Book only; and furthermore no such passages containing *ὅδε* are found in this book. It is noteworthy that this fifth book deals with a period in which the war though, according to Thucydides' view, alive, yet was not in actual progress. The context of the exceptional passage in the Fourth Book is noteworthy in the same respect. It runs thus (ch. 116, ad fin.): 'And with the passing of winter the eighth year of the war (*τῷ πολέμῳ*) came to an end.'

Ch. 117 then opens with the words: 'Immediately on the arrival of the Spring of the following summer half of the year the Lacedaemonians and Athenians made a truce for one year.' The juxtaposition of these two passages is remarkable in view of the special wording of the passages in the Fifth Book. The close of the eighth year of the war came in a period during which there was a pause in the operations, which pause was immediately confirmed by a regular truce. It came in fact within a time which, though not covered by the regular truce, might nevertheless be conceivably regarded as part of that period of cessation of hostilities which the truce formally established. It is true that the truce was not fully observed, because Brasidas in Chalkidike refused to regard it. Still it was actual throughout the rest of the area of warfare.

These considerations suggest, therefore, that one significance of *ὅδε* in the passages referring to the close of the years of the war is that it indicates that at the time that that

particular year, in connection with which it is used, came to an end, the war was in active progress.<sup>2</sup>

It is further possible that the correspondence of the formula in iv. 116 with the formula employed in Book v., and this despite the fact that the circumstances were not in strict correspondence with those dealt with in Book v., is due to a peculiarly deliberate act on the part of Thucydides. He was emphatic in asserting that the 'years of peace' of Book v. were in reality part of the war; and by the use of this formula in Book iv. 116 he identifies the circumstances of the truce of the Ten Years' War,—a period which all would reckon as part of that war,—with the circumstances of those 'years of peace' which, as he claims, but nobody else thought, were really part of the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

In these passages, therefore, which refer to the dating of the years of the war, *ὅδε* following the noun *πόλεμος* appears to have at least one special significance, *i.e.* Thucydides uses it of that which is in active and actual existence at the time of speaking; but omits it when the existence has been brought to an end, even if that end be only temporary, *before* the time of speaking.

It remains to be considered whether this is the only significance which *ὅδε* in this position possesses.

This involves a review of two series of passages:

(1) Those in which *ὅδε* follows *πόλεμος* in passages which do not refer to the dating of the years of the war.

(2) Those in which *ὅδε* follows other nouns than *πόλεμος*.

The passages in which *ὅδε* follows *πόλεμος* without reference to the dating of years of the war are: iii. 11; iii. 54; iii. 113; iv. 48; iv. 133; v. 20 (twice).

In iii. 11 the Mytilenians are represented as saying: 'Our survival was due to our courting their commons and the prominent men of the moment. But, judging from

<sup>2</sup>This conclusion is important, because in passages in which *ὅδε* succeeds nouns other than *πόλεμος*, the existence, at the time of speaking, of that which is referred to by *ὅδε* is a marked peculiarity of most of the passages.

<sup>1</sup>The passage is: *ἦν δὲ γε οἶμαι ποτε ἄλλος πόλεμος καταλάβη Δωρικὸς τοῦδε ὑστερος καὶ ξυμβῇ γενέσθαι ἡμῶν . . .* Here *τοῦδε* must almost certainly refer to the Ten Years' War, because, as Ulrich points out, the passage is written in obvious ignorance of the fact that the taking of Athens and the decision of the Dekeleian War was finally brought about by long continued starvation. The Dekeleian War, too, was another Dorian War.



the example of what has happened to others, we had no prospect of being able to maintain our position for long, had not this war (ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε) arisen.'

*In iii. 54* the Plataeans are represented as saying: 'We assert in answer to the curt question, whether we have done any good to the Lacedaemonians and their allies in this war (ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷδε) that, if you put the question to us as enemies then we have not wronged you by not serving you, or, if you put it to us as assumed friends, then you yourselves are in the wrong since you have invaded us.'

*In iii. 113* the disaster which overtook the Ambrakiots at Olpae and Idomene is spoken of as 'the greatest disaster of all which occurred during this war (κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε) in the same number of days to any individual Greek city.'

*In iv. 48* Thucydides, speaking of the στάσις at Corcyra and the final destruction of the aristocrats, says that 'the civil disturbance, which had been violent, ended in this incident,' ὅσα γε κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε.

*In iv. 133* speaking of the flight of Chrysis after the burning of the temple of Hera at Argos, he says: 'Chrysis' tenure of the priesthood up to the time of her flight overlapped eight years, and half of the ninth of this war' (τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε).

*In v. 20* Thucydides says: 'This treaty was made at the close of winter as spring was coming on, immediately after the city Dionysia, exactly ten years and a few days having elapsed since first the invasion of Attica and the beginning of this war (τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε) took place.'

Again in the same chapter: 'If, according to the practice in this history, the reader reckons by summers and winters, each having the value of half a year, he will find that ten summers and as many winters fall within the period of this first war.' (τῷ πρώτῳ πολέμῳ τῷδε γεγεννημένους.)

In these passages two uses of ὅδε may be distinguished:

(1) As referring to something in existence at the time of speaking, viz. iii. 11, iv. 48.

(2) As referring to something in existence up to the time of speaking, viz. iii. 54, iv. 133, v. 20 (twice).

The passage iv. 48 belongs to one of the two uses; but, until some decision has been arrived at with regard to the exact meaning of ὅσα γε κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε in its special context, it is impossible to say which.

The passages in which ὅδε is used referring to the dating by years imply probably both ideas, viz. 'the war up to this time and which was in active progress at the moment.'

Owing to the very nature of the above passages ὅδε has a 'temporal' significance, that is to say, it limits in respect to time the noun to which it applies. Moreover, it appears to imply a very definite limitation in the mind of the speaker.

One of the general facts which has been shown to be apparent from an examination of the passages in which ὅδε is used with πόλεμος is that up to the thirty-third chapter of the Second Book this adjective precedes the noun. The use of ὅδε in the First Book and in these earlier chapters of the Second Book may therefore be its ordinary use of an event still to come. This would be natural in the First Book, where the author is dealing with events before the war opened. But even in the passages in the beginning of the Second Book the futurity of the war, or of part of it, is implied. In ii. 16 the reference is to the habitual residence of the majority of the population of Attica in rural districts, μέχρι τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου: in ii. 21 to an invasion of Attica, πρὸ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου: in ii. 34 to the funeral oration of Perikles as the first example, ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ, of a practice which was customary, and which was presumably carried out on subsequent occasions during the war. Even in this passage the future course of the war, which had then only just begun, was prominently before the mind of the writer.

In the passages in the later books, however (vi. 17, vii. 44, vii. 56), the idea of futurity in the expression ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος is not traceable; and the adjective seems to be used merely as determinative of the identity of the war, without implying that it was in whole or in part a future event.

Thus the remarkable contrast between the use of ὅδε before the noun in the early part of the first half of the history, and its use after the noun in the later part of the same

half, seems to be deliberate in the full sense. The difference of position implies a marked difference of meaning.

Expressed in general terms, the difference is that ὅδε before the noun is used in these early passages in its ordinary prospective sense, whereas in the cases in which it follows the nouns it is usually employed in a retrospective sense.

The retrospective meaning of the adjective ὅδε is not identical with that of οὗτος, in that it seems to imply what οὗτος does not necessarily imply, namely, that that which is spoken of existed not merely in the past, but either at or up to the time of speaking.

This implication is of course most marked in those passages in which ὅδε is used expressly as determinative of time; but it is also traceable in other passages in which the idea of time is not prominent. This comes out on examination of the passages in which ὅδε as an attribute follows nouns other than πόλεμος.

There are twenty-eight such passages in Thucydides' work, in fifteen of which the definite article is also used with the noun with which ὅδε agrees.

Of these passages twenty refer to circumstances, things or periods which were in existence at the time of mention, while in all cases either their existence in the past, or some action relating to them in the past, is mentioned or implied.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The passages are:

i. 2. *παράδειγμα τῶδε*: the example is given in the immediately preceding text.

i. 53. In an Athenian speech: reference to the Corcyreans 'our present allies, to whose assistance we went' in the past.

i. 68. In the Corinthian speech at the first Congress at Sparta: reference to 'the allies present,' who have been allies in the past.

i. 75. In the Athenian speech at the first Congress at Sparta: reference to the empire still existent, and to the mode in which it was acquired in the past.

i. 140. In Perikles' speech: reference to the Peloponnesian embassy, then apparently at Athens, and to previous embassies from the same quarter.

ii. 34. Reference to the public funeral of those who had fallen in the war. The *τάφον* mentioned is one of a previous series, but the first is this war. Reference has also been made in the immediately preceding text to this particular funeral.

ii. 35. In the Funeral Oration: reference to *τὸν λόγον τόνδε* in a speech which is actually being made.

In these twenty passages the special use of ὅδε is naturally most apparent in those in which time is definitely mentioned, as in iii. 13 and viii. 99, or definitely implied, as in i. 53, i. 75, i. 140, iv. 85, vi. 12; but the 'temporal' idea is always behind this use of ὅδε, even if the reference to the past be merely to that which has been just previously mentioned by the historian, as in i. 8, ii. 34, v. 18, v. 22, v. 68, vi. 78. The remainder of the twenty-eight passages stand in a class by themselves. In them ὅδε is used after

It has been already clearly indicated in the text that similar speeches had been made in the past.

ii. 35. In the same oration: reference to the funeral—*περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε*—which is proceeding, but not concluded. Similar funeral ceremonies had been carried out in the past.

ii. 64. In Perikles' speech: reference to the plague which was still in existence, and had been in the past.

ii. 74. In Archidamos' speech at Plataea: reference to Plataea and to the beginning of the invasion, a matter in the then past.

iii. 13. Reference to a proposed invasion of Attica in the summer in which the proposal is made: 'if you invade a *second* time this summer'; i.e. reference to a previous invasion.

iii. 57. In the Plataean speech: reference to their trial which is proceeding.

iii. 85. In a speech of Brasidas: reference to his own army, which is then present, and to the fact that he had had it with him in the past at Nisaea.

v. 18. Reference to the terms of a treaty which have been stated in the previous text. In this case the language is apparently that of an official formula, not that of Thucydides himself.

v. 22. Reference to an alliance then being made, and whose existence has been already indicated in the previous text.

v. 68. Reference to the order of battle at Mantinea, which has just been described in the previous chapter.

vi. 9. Reference to an *ἐκκλησία* which is already assembled.

vi. 12. In a speech of Nikias: reference to the Sicilian fugitives, who have already asked for help.

vi. 40. In a speech of Athenagoras: reference to Syracuse as it was at the time—a democracy; a contrast with the past implied.

vi. 78. Reference to an envy and fear which is felt by one state of another, and to which the speaker has already referred in the previous sentence.

vii. 66. In the speech of Gylippos: reference to Sicily or Syracuse and to the original coming of the Athenians, spoken of as in the recent past.

viii. 99. Reference to the summer which is running its course at the time of speaking, and to an event which had previously taken place in the same summer.

the noun, refers to a quotation, or, in one case, to a list, which *immediately* follow in the text. This use is found in six passages.<sup>1</sup>

These passages have certain noticeable points of resemblance:

(1) That to which reference is made follows, as has been already mentioned, immediately in the text.

(2) In five out of six passages that to which reference is made is a quotation in the actual words of the original, while in the sixth (ii. 9) it is a list which may conceivably have been drawn from some official source.

The idea lying behind the use of *ὅδε* in these passages is doubtful. It may be that the adjective is put immediately before the quotation, that is to say, after the noun with which it agrees, on the analogy of the pronoun *τοιαύδε* as used in the introduction of speeches into the text. But it is also possible that the idea expressed by *ὅδε* after the noun may extend in some instances to that which has a definite termination in that future which *immediately* follows the time of speaking, and, on the analogy of this temporal use, be applied to that which immediately follows in the text.

The examination of these passages in Thucydides' work seems then to show that the author used the adjective *ὅδε* after the noun in two or possibly three senses:

(1) Of that which had an existence in the past and which was still in existence at the time of speaking.

(2) Of that which had an existence in the past and whose existence extended up to the time of speaking; and possibly

(3) Of that which terminated in an immediate future known at the time of speaking.

This third possible use might easily

develop out of the first use, in which a certain futurity of existence is implied though not postulated.

For practical, and indeed for theoretical purposes, the three uses have to be distinguished, but one general idea underlies all of them, the idea, namely, of the existence of that to which reference is made, at least up to the time of speaking.

The importance of these uses in relation to the date of the composition of various passages in the history need not be emphasised. These passages relate to various incidents in the Ten Years' War, in that part of Thucydides' History which extends from ii. 47 to v. 25 inclusive.

It has been sufficiently indicated in what has been already said on this question that the passages which state the termination of the years of the war have no significance in this connection. *ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε* in these passages refers neither to the Ten Years' War nor to the whole war, but simply to the war up to the time of speaking.

But there are other passages in this section in which the expression is used, which have provoked a great deal of comment both from Ullrich and his followers and their opponents. It is commonly argued by the progressives that the expression as originally written by Thucydides meant 'the whole war,' but that the circumstances mentioned in the passages make it impossible to suppose that the Twenty-Seven Years' War could be implied, and therefore Thucydides when he wrote those passages had the Ten Years' War, and the Ten Years' War only, in his mind. In other words, they were written in the first draft of his history, were never revised, and are in fact part of the proof that a first draft of this part of the history was written. It has been necessary to examine the majority of these passages from a general point of view in the course of this inquiry; but it is now necessary to examine them further with special reference to the evidence they afford, in the light of the conclusions already arrived at, as to the date of their composition. It may be well to add to them certain passages from the same section of the history (ii. 47-v. 25) which contain kindred expressions.

i. 132. *τὸ ἐλεγείον τόδε*: the lines immediately follow.

ii. 9. *πόλεις τὰςδε*: a list of the states immediately follows.

iii. 104. *ἐν τοῖς ἔπεισι τοῖςδε*: the lines immediately quoted.

iv. 105. *κήρυγμα τόδε*: proclamation immediately quoted.

iv. 117. *ἐκεχειρία . . . ἥδε*: terms of the truce immediately given.

viii. 57. *σπονδὰς τρίτας τὰςδε*: terms of the treaty immediately given.



The passages to be considered are contained in iii. 11, iii. 54, iii. 98, iii. 113, iv. 48, iv. 133.

In all these the expression  $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\delta\epsilon$  is employed. The kindred passages are contained in ii. 25, ii. 94, iii. 68, iv. 40. In them the expression employed is  $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ . In the first of these two series, if the conclusions already arrived at are sound,  $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\delta\epsilon$  must be intended to express one of three ideas either in the mind of the writer or attributed by him to some person or persons on his historical stage, these ideas being 'the war at present going on,' or 'the war up to this time,' 'this war which has a definite and known termination in the near future.'

In iii. 11 the Mytilenians are represented as referring to  $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\delta\epsilon$ . The meaning is obviously 'the war at present going on.' Consequently the passage throws no light on the date of composition.<sup>1</sup>

In iii. 54 the Plataeans are represented as saying that they have been curiously asked whether they have done any good to the Lacedaemonians and their allies,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ . Some commentators<sup>2</sup> regard this use of the expression as equivalent to that in iii. 11.

In iii. 52 Thucydides gives in an oblique form the question originally put, and there the expression used is  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\tau\iota$ . In iii. 68 reference is again twice made to the same question, first in the words  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ \tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\ \tilde{\upsilon}\pi'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \pi\epsilon\pi\tilde{\omicron}\nu\theta\alpha\sigma\iota$ , and secondly in the words  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ \tau\iota\ \Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\tilde{\nu}\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\ \delta\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\tilde{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota\tilde{\nu}$ .

The expression in iii. 52 means undoubtedly 'the existing war';<sup>3</sup> but the use of the perfect tense in both passages in iii. 68 points to a meaning 'the war up to the present time,' which is probably the meaning of the expression in iii. 54.

In any case the passage does not throw any light on the date of composition, as, whichever of these two meanings were attached to the expression, the expression itself might stand either in a history of the

Ten Years' War or in one of the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

In iii. 98 comes the first of a series of passages in which a particular event is compared with other events of the same kind in the course of the war. Of those Athenian hoplites who fell in Demosthenes' defeat in Aetolia it is said that they were 'the best men of the state of Athens who perished,'  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omega\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ . Herbst<sup>4</sup> thinks that the expression must be understood to refer to the Ten Years' War. That the expression does not imply a comparison extending beyond the Ten Years' War is, judged by the general usage of it in Thucydides, almost certainly the case. It might of course imply 'the present war,' or 'the war up to this time.' But in any case the expression might have been used by one who was writing either the history of the Ten Years' War or that of the Twenty-Seven Years' War, and is therefore quite indeterminate as to the date of the writing of the passage.

In iii. 113 the disaster to the Ambrakiots at Olpae and Idomene is said to have been the greatest which overtook any single Greek city within the same number of days,  $\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\nu}\delta\epsilon$ .

The meaning of the expression used in this passage is clearly determined by use of a similar expression in a later passage, which must be taken in juxtaposition with it.

In iv. 48 Thucydides, speaking of the  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  at Corcyra, says that it came to an end,  $\delta\sigma\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\nu}\delta\epsilon$ , with the murder of the Aristocrats. Enough is known of the later history of Corcyra to make it certain that Thucydides could not in these words have been referring to the Twenty-Seven Years' War. The wording of the passage clearly shows that the historian knew of some later civil disturbances at Corcyra. But Thucydides cannot have known of any such disturbance at Corcyra after the Twenty-Seven Years' War, because it was not until thirty years<sup>5</sup> after that war came to an end that such a disturbance took place. But in Diodoros<sup>6</sup> there is mention

<sup>4</sup> *Philologus*, 38.

<sup>5</sup> In 374 B.C. Cf. Diodoros, xv. 46 and 47, and Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 4-38.

<sup>6</sup> xiii. 48.

<sup>1</sup> Herbst, *Philologus*, 38, takes this view of the meaning.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Herbst, *Philologus*, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ii. 2.

of one under the archonship of Glaukippos in 410, and a reference in the context to the earlier civil war described by Thucydides. It must, therefore, be the events of the year 410 which the historian had in his mind when he limited his assertion to 'this war,' and 'this war' can only mean the Ten Years' War. It would seem, therefore, that in this passage the words *κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε* belong to the second draft of this part of his history, and have been inserted on revision.

But it is improbable that Thucydides used this expression, *κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε*, in a wholly different sense in iii. 113 from that in which he used it in iv. 48, and therefore his remark with regard to the disaster to Ambrakia must be understood to imply a comparison with other events of a similar kind during the Ten Years' War, and the *τόνδε* in the expression may be a later addition to the text.

In iv. 133 the priesthood of Chrysis of Argos is said to have overlapped the first eight and a half years. The expression may mean the Ten Years' War, but it is more probable that *ὅδε* is used, as in the dating of the years of the war, as meaning the war 'up to this point.' The expression is, in other words, correspondent to and suggested by the statement made in the sentence.

In itself the expression *ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε* in these passages does not give any clue to the date of their composition, but does not necessarily imply their revision. In all of them, with the exception of that in iv. 48, it might conceivably be used by a writer who was narrating either the story of the Ten Years' War only, or that of the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

For the main purpose of the discussion of the determination of the date of composition of these parts of Thucydides' history, the conclusion is itself inconclusive from a positive point of view, but it proves the important negative that these passages are *not*, as has been sometimes alleged, cases of unrevised elements in the first draft of the first half of the history. If they have any significance in this respect, it is that they have been revised.

#### CONCLUSION.

It may be well, perhaps, if I state briefly what I believe to be the conclusions which may be arrived at, and which I have expressed already in this paper.

(1) In all the passages in which *ὅδε* is used before *πόλεμος* by Thucydides in the first half of his history, the idea of the futurity of the war is obviously present in the mind of the writer [cf. the passages in the first book and the early chapters of the second book], whereas in all the passages in this part of the history in which *ὅδε* is used after *πόλεμος*, the idea *uppermost* in the mind of the writer is not the future but the present, and in most of them the present is the terminus of the idea, *i.e.* the idea of futurity is excluded.

(2) In this latter series of passages the idea takes various forms:

(a) That which is in *active* existence at the present and has been in existence in the past [this shown in the passages on dating of the year of the war] and arising, perhaps, out of this, certain passages in which the idea is of that which is in active existence in the present, has been in existence in the past, and has a definite, known terminus in the near future.

(b) That which has existed in the past and up to the present. [Passages in v. 20.]

On the question with which I am mainly concerned, the order of composition of various parts of Thucydides' history, those passages throw hardly any light.

Those in which *ὅδε* precedes *πόλεμος* might refer to either war and their reference, when determinable, can only be determined by their context.

Those in which *ὅδε* succeeds *πόλεμος* are so definitely limited with respect to time that, even if they had appeared in what was originally the story of the Ten Years' War, they might stand unaltered in a history of the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

There is, of course, the possibility that the *ὅδε* in some of these passages has been inserted on revision. Although I am on other grounds inclined to believe that Thucydides originally wrote the first half of his

history as a history of the Ten Years' War, and the Ten Years' War only, and wrote it too before the Dekelean War began, yet I

cannot, like Ullrich and his school, cite these passages in support of this view.

G. B. GRUNDY.

#### THE DATE OF THE DISAPPEARANCE OF LEGIO XXI. RAPAX.

THE fate of this legion, the exploits of which are frequently mentioned by Tacitus both in the *Annals* and the *Histories*, is one of the many obscure points in the history of the Roman army at the end of the first century, to which modern research can give nothing but probable explanations. It is usually considered that the latest evidence for its existence is contained on the Mirebeau tiles, which can be dated to 83, and some inscriptions on the limes which probably belong to the same period, and most writers, particularly Ritterling and Filow in his recent essay on the legions of Moesia in *Klio*, 1906, consider that it was destroyed in the Danubian campaigns of Domitian. It has therefore frequently been identified with the 'legione cum legato simul caesa' of Suetonius (*Vita Dom.* c. 6). Trommsdorf, however (*Quaestiones duo ad historiam legionum Romanarum spectantes*, 1896), following an earlier suggestion of Schilling, has pointed out that this theory involves considerable difficulties. There must have been 29 legions existing when Trajan called his new legion XXX. Ulpia, and this legion must have preceded II. Traiana, which can only have been so numbered as being the second legion of Trajan. Now, it is generally stated that of the thirty-four legions existing at one time or another between Tiberius and Trajan four (I., IV. Macedonica, XV. Primigenia, and XVI.) were disbanded by Vespasian for complicity in the revolt of Civilis, and two others (V. Alaudae and XXI. Rapax) were destroyed on the Danube in the reign of Domitian. According to this reckoning only 28 legions remain at the accession of Trajan. Trommsdorf therefore, relying chiefly on a new interpretation of an inscription (*C.I.L.* III. n. 6813), considers that

only one legion (V. Alaudae) was destroyed in the reign of Domitian, and that XXI. Rapax survived into the reign of Trajan. Further than this he does not go, except to suggest that the erasure of the title of the legion on an early German inscription (*Inscr. Helv.* n. 248) indicates that the legion was eventually disbanded in disgrace. It seems possible to define even more closely the date of this disappearance. No regular system was observed by the emperors in numbering the legions which they raised, but it is certainly curious that Trajan, after having been struck with the idea of numbering his first legion XXX., should not have gone on to number his second XXXI. This, however, can be explained if we consider that XXI. Rapax disappeared after the creation of XXX. Ulpia, but before the creation of II. Traiana. In that case the total number of legions was again 29, and the new one had naturally to be numbered on a different principle. Now II. Traiana was certainly raised before 109, since an inscription (*C.I.L.* III. n. 79) of it exists in Egypt dated in February of that year, and Trommsdorf has given good reason for supposing that it succeeded III. Cyrenaica in that province in 106. We may therefore place the disappearance of XXI. Rapax between this year and 98. Further than this it is impossible to go with certainty, but a study of Trajan's column shows that his first Dacian campaign met with a decided check if not a serious reverse, and the 'ignominiosa missio' of the legion may well have been a consequence of its behaviour on that occasion.

G. L. CHEESMAN.

Christ Church, Oxford.

## MORE FRAGMENTS OF SAPPHO.

In the fifth volume of the *Berliner Klassikertexte* there are three small fragments from the same book of Sappho's poems as the two which have already been re-edited in the *Classical Review*.<sup>1</sup> Only one of these three appears there with the words spaced. After a careful study of photographs of all the fragments I have been led to conclude that with regard to the first the views of Blass and others need some revision, and that something more can be made of the second than has yet been done. The third, consisting as it apparently does of the ends of longish lines, can give us some help in the metre of the other two, and contains one or two useful parallels. I refer to the poems of my former article by the numbers I, II, and III, and to the three pieces which are the subject of the present paper by the letters α, β, and γ.

α. In the first piece Sappho sings of a conversation with her pupil Gongyla, in which she tells of a dream in which Hermes appeared to her. Guided by the second piece and to some extent by the third, I differ from previous editors in regarding the second line of the stanza as consisting of eleven syllables like the first. Thus the metre of this poem—as of the next—is like that of II except in the second line. The first three syllables can be — — —, — — —, or — — —, and the group — — — — occurs in various places in the line, but never more than once in the same line.

## Text:

του[ . . . . .  
 ἦρ' α[ . . . . .  
 δῆρα το[ . . . . .  
 Γογγύλα τ[ . . . . .  
 5 ἦ τί σ' αὖ' ἐθέλ[ης δείκνυαι τέως  
 παῖσι; Μάλιστά γ', [ἄμειβόμαν ἔγω· Ἔρ-  
 μας γ' εἰσηλθ' ἐπὶ [δὲ βλέποισ' ἔγω Fe  
 εἶπον· ὦ δέσποτ', ἔπ[παν ὀλώλαμεν  
 οὐ μὰ γὰρ μάκαιραν [δέσποιναν ἔγωγ'  
 10 οὐδ' ἄδομ' ἔπαρθ' ἄγα[ν ἔτ' ὀλβωι,

<sup>1</sup> June '09.

κατ' ἄνῃν δ' ἡμέρος τις ἦ[γρεσέ με  
 λῶ σ' αὖ' εἰς δροσόνεντ' ἀγ[ρον σ' ἄμμ', ἵνα περ  
 Ἀτρήϊδην Ἀγαμ[έωνον' ἀγαγες πρὶν

.]. δεῖται. [. . . . .  
 15 .]. ἡδέτογ. [. . . . .  
 .]. ἄτισε. [. . . . .

## Critical Notes:

4 The apparent apostrophe between γγ is prob. accidental: τ corr. from δ, we should therefore comparing II. 19. prob. read τ': the blank contained 'asked' and part of the question 5 ἐθέλης, for — — — in this position cf. β 5: not necessarily ἐθέλησθα, cf. Meister-Ahrens i. p. 186: Blass ἦ τίς ἄμμ' ἐθέλεξεν θέος 6 B μάλιστα μὲν αὐτος Ἔρ., but — — — twice in the same line is prob. unmetrical 7 MS ἰσηλθ' (i corr. from ε) 8 MS επ not εγ or εν 10 B ἀγαν ἐπ' ὀλβωι: ἐτ' Jurenka 10/11 Over κα a horizontal line separating the stanzas, so I. and II. 11 ἦ not ε[ 12 MS λωστήσις, cf. 7 ἰσηλθ': ἀγ[ or αμ[ 12/13 B [δ· | βροῖς ἰδὼν [στεφάνους προκείσθ' ἔχουσιν 13 MS ἰδ: MS has upper traces of αγαγ[ or αγαμ[

## Translation:

. . . And Gongyla [asked me ' . . . . .] or what sign wilt thou show thy children?' 'Yea, I will tell you,' I answered; 'Hermes came in unto me, and looking upon him I said "O master, I am altogether undone. For by the holy mistress I swear to thee, I care nothing any more that I am exalted unto prosperity, but a desire hath taken me to die. I would fain have thee set me in the dewy meadow whither aforetime thou leddest Atreus' son Agamemnon. . . ."'

## Commentary:

- Γογγύλα: of Colophon, one of the three pupils mentioned by Suidas.
- ἔγω Ἔρ.: for the crasis cf. *Ode 1 ὠράνω αἰθέρος*, Fr. 68<sup>1</sup> κείσεαι οὐδέποστα, Fr. 85 ἔγω οὐδέ.
- ἔππαν: i.e. ἐπίπαν; for ἐππ see my note on III. 2, and for πᾶν M.-A. i. p. 36.
- δέσποιναν: Aphrodite.
- ἐπαρθαι: perfect passive infinitive = ἐπῆρθαι.
- ἡγρεσε: cf. *Ode 2. 14 τρώμοι με | παῖσαν ἄγρει*. Sappho perhaps wrote ἄγρεσε.

<sup>1</sup> Bergk<sup>4</sup>.



12. λῶ: there seems to be no Aeolic parallel, but the letters λωστηρ are certain.  
στάσαι: infinitive.

δροσύνει: cf. χρυσίσαισι and Λυδίαν, *Fr.* 85.

- 12/13. Ἰναπερ' | Διτρήδην 'Αγαμέμνον': cf. the Song of Harmodius Ἰναπερ ποδώκης 'Αχιλλεύς, | Τυδείδην τέ φασιν Διομηδέα. The next line probably contained other names.

β. The first four lines of this piece do not appear in the *Berliner Klassikertexte*, and the remainder is given there unspaced. The dotted letters are to be regarded as rather more than usually doubtful, especially as the lettering on the other side of the page often shows through in the photograph. But by various expedients, such as putting tracings of the two sides back to back and using tracings of letter-groups from other parts of the MS to confirm my observation, I have, I hope, guarded effectively against seeing what is not there. Sappho is apparently telling how one of her girl-friends came and awoke her one morning, and the fragment consists largely, if not entirely, of the words she puts into the mouth of the friend.

#### Text:

Ψάπφ', ἡ μὲν οὕτω δέ γ' οὐ σε φιλήσω.

ὦ φαίν' ἄμμι, κῆξ' εὐναγ' λῦσε τέαν

πεφίλημ[έν]αν ἱζχυν, ὕδατι δέ

κρίνον: ὦ]σπερ ἰλνίτας πᾶρ ἔχθωι

- 5 πέπλον Χίον ἀπύσχοισα λοῖξο  
καὶ Κλεῖς σάων καββάλοις γρύταν  
κροκόεντα λώπεά σ' ἐββάλη καὶ

πέπλον πορφύρε[ι]ον. . . . .  
χλαιναι πέρ σ' ἐξ[.] . . . . .

- 10 στέφανοι περ[.] . . . . . ] . . . . .

κάλθος σάμιν[.] . . . . .  
φρύσσον ὦ πρ[.] . . . . . ]σε . . . . .  
παρθένων πο[.] . . . . . ]ον . . . . .

ταπα . . . . . [.] . . . . .

- 15 . . . . . [.] . . . . .  
π. . . . . [.] . . . . .

#### Critical Notes:

- 2 MS ἡμμε mistaking the intransitive use of φαῖνε  
4 MS ἰλνίτης 5 MS χιον (not κων), o corr. from  
τ, the scribe having begun to write χιτωνα 6 MS  
κλεῖς: MS γρύτων 7 MS ἐββλη 9 χλαιναι?  
MS τ over ε in περ.

#### Translation:

' . . . Sappho, I swear, if thou come not forth I will love thee no more. O rise and shine upon us, and from thy bed set free thy beloved strength, and then with water by the bank, like the lily that dwells in the marsh, hold aloof thy Chian robe and wash thee. And Cleis for thy adorning shall cast down from thy press saffron smock and purple robe. . . . '

#### Commentary:

- Ψάπφ', ἡ μὲν: so I. 6, where I would now put the colon at the end of the preceding line.  
οὕτω δέ γ': 'unless thou wilt rise and come forth,' doubtless referring to the previous line.  
φιλήσω: cf. Plautus' use of *amabo* = 'I prithee.'
- φαῖνε: for the intransitive use, which suggests a heavenly body rising, cf. Theocr. 2. 11 et al.  
κῆξ: cf. κῆρ, *Fr.* 68. 3.
- ἰλνίτας: the ν seems conclusive against connecting the word with ἔλος 'marsh' and Theocritus' *ελιπενής* (13, 42) rather than with ἰλός 'mud.' Moreover, Hesychius explains *ελός* (*sic*) as τὸ πηλῶδες τοῦ ποταμοῦ 'the muddy part of the river.' The literal meaning, then, is 'dweller in the marshy river-edge.' The use of a noun in -της in apposition to the neuter κρίνον is strange, but not, I think, impossible. Lucian speaks of νησιώτη μειρακίω *de Domo*, 3. It has the effect of personifying κρίνον.  
ἐχθωι: i.e. δχθωι, cf. M.-A. p. 53.
- πέπλον Χίον: cf. Lucr. 4. 1130, where editors have needlessly altered the reading to *Cia*, i.e. *Keia*.  
ἀπύσχοισα: this can hardly mean 'throwing aside,' but rather 'keeping out of the way,' e.g. by tying it round the waist so as to leave the upper part of the body bare, or, if we imagine her standing in the water, by girding it up to prevent it getting wet.
- Κλεῖς: Sappho's daughter, mentioned *Fr.* 85, where the MSS read *Kleis*, but a trochee is required.  
σάων: for the σ-form cf. σῶ Alc. 74; we are told that Sappho used the form *Μωσάων* *Fr.* 164, cf. also my note on I. 23.  
γρύταν: cf. *Fr.* 156 and Mahaffy *Flinders-Petrie Pap.* ii. 32. 27 (*Herwerden Lexicon Suppl.* s.v.).
- ἐββάλη: i.e. ἐπιβαλεῖ, 'shall put upon thee'; see note on *ἐππαν* above.
- πορφύριον: may scan as 4 or 3 syllables; in either case -ον must be followed by a consonant.
- κάλθος: this I take to be a masculine form of the flower-name *caltha* of Vergil *Ecl.* 2. 50. Prudentius uses a neuter form *calthum*.
- φρύσσον: perhaps aorist imperative of φρύγω, Attic φρύζον.

7. The third piece is written on the back of the fragmentary page which contains the first. We accordingly have only the ends of the lines. By a comparison of the two sides of the page I conclude that the lines were of about the same length in both poems, and I believe the metre to be the same. In line 4 *μῖαν* seems to be for . . . *μειᾶν*, the earlier part of the word being lost. In line 8 *ὄξεν βοῶν* gives a parallel to *ἐλθην ὄξεν βοῶν* in II. 19. In line 9 *οὐκὶ* is an interesting form; cf. in III. 8 the MS *οὐκ'οὔτω*. In the same line the form *βάρν* is decisive against the equation *βόρηται* = *βορέται* in II. 18 (on a page from the same MS book), and so indirectly supports my interpretation of *βόρηται* as 'devours.'

Text:

. . . . . ] . v. [ . . . . . ] ω . . . . . ] μοι ἀναξ . . . . . ] . μῖαν ἦχον  
5 . . . . . ] παρθενίαν . . . . . ] ὀρρώδων ὑπεραν . . . . . ] φεν . . αβ. φς . . φ . . . . . ] εφραν ἀρ' ὄξεν βοῶν δ' . . . . . ] παφ. ηχς ενξ οὐκὶ βάρν  
10 . . . . .

My thanks are due to Dr. W. Schubart, of the Königliche Museen, Berlin, for very kindly furnishing me with excellent photographs of the above fragments.

J. M. EDMONDS.

#### AN IMPORTANT INSCRIPTION RELATING TO THE SOCIAL WAR.

IN June of last year Professor Gatti, with equal perspicacity and good fortune, acquired for the municipal collections of Rome a bronze plate (with holes for the nails by which it was once fixed to a wall), bearing an inscription of singular interest and importance, which is now to be seen in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. Professor Gatti's publication of it has just appeared in the third part of the *Bullettino Comunale* for 1908, pp. 169 sqq., with a full-size photograph. The plate measures 29 cm. (11 in.) high, and 51 to 52 cm. (20 in.) long; and the inscription contains two decrees issued, as we shall see, in camp before Asculum at the end of 90 B.C. by Cn. Pompeius Strabo as commander of the Roman forces in Picenum during the Social War, conferring Roman citizenship and certain other rewards on some members of a Spanish troop of auxiliary cavalry, the *turma Salluitana*.

Of the first few lines of the inscription only about one-third, on the left, is preserved: but the rest is practically complete. It begins as follows (according to Professor Gatti's restoration):

[C]n. Pompeius Sex. [f. imperator infra scriptos<sup>1</sup>]

<sup>1</sup> Professor Bormann suggests *turmae Salluitanae*.

*equites Hispanos ceives [Romanos, virtutis causa de consili sententia pronuntiavit] ex lege Julia. In consilio [fuerunt].*

Then follows a list of the *consilium*, sixty in number, as can be calculated from the space occupied in the lines now lost, the greater part of the names being preserved. The praenomen, nomen, the father's praenomen and tribe are alone given. A fair proportion of them seem to belong to Picenum itself, no less than eleven being members of the *tribus Velina*.

So far the inscription has run right across the plate. We now come to the list of the soldiers of the *turma Salluitana*, arranged in three columns, leaving a space in the right bottom corner, of which we shall speak later. The name itself is conjectured by Professor Gatti (and probably he is right) to be identical with Salduba, Salduva, or Salduvia (the MSS. vary), which, as Pliny (*H.N.* iii. 24) tells us, was the former name of Caesar-augusta, the modern Saragossa. In the case of the first four of the soldiers mentioned, unlike the rest, the place of origin is not stated, and Professor Bormann has suggested that they were the officers in command, the commander of the troop and the three *decuriones*. To the names of the other

Numis  
MAU  
Pp.  
EUSEB  
Great  
the grea

twenty-six the place or tribe to which they belonged is added: some of these local names are unknown, but all that are known occur in Pliny's list of the principal tribes of the *conventus* of the district of Caesaraugusta, so that we may assume that the rest belonged to the same district. The names are all purely barbaric, and interesting to the philologist.

The space in the lower right-hand corner of the plate is occupied by the text of the second decree, by which certain rewards were conferred on the soldiers of the troop for their valour—*Cn. Pompeius Sex. f. imperator | virtutis causa turmam | Salluitanam donavit in | castris apud Asculum | cornuculo et patella torque | armilla palereis (sic) et frumenium (sic) | duplex.*

An important difference may be noticed at once between the two decrees: in the first, conferring the citizenship, the grant is made with the approval of the *consilium*, which normally consisted of all the military tribunes present and the chief centurion (*primuspilus*) of each legion (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, i<sup>3</sup>. 316), and, no doubt, in virtue of special provisions contained in the *lex Julia* of 90 B.C. For the second, no such approval was needed, the ordinary powers included in the *imperium* being sufficient. The interesting particular is here added, that the gift was made 'in camp before Asculum' (modern Ascoli Piceno). That both decrees were promulgated at the same time, there is no doubt; and as there is no mention of Pompeius being consul, which he became in 89 B.C., the inscription must belong to the

end of 90 B.C., *i.e.* to the beginning of the siege of Asculum, whither after the victory of Pompeius over Lafernius at Firmum the survivors of the defeated Piceni took refuge. Of the gifts mentioned, that of the *corniculum* is known to us from a passage of Livy (x. 61), where, coupled with the bracelet (both being in that case of silver), it was given to cavalry soldiers who had distinguished themselves in the third Samnite war. Of the gift of the *patella* (probably also of silver), or small patera for libations, no other case appears to be known, except that of the gift to Probus in his youth of a patera weighing five pounds, among other rewards, for conspicuous bravery in the Sarmatian war (Vopiscus, *Vita Probi*, 5, 1). The other ornaments are well known, and were constantly given as rewards of valour, and the gift of double rations of corn (or double pay, as it later on came to mean) was so frequent that the term *duplarius* or *duplicarius* is often met with in inscriptions of the imperial period.

The exact provenance of this inscription is not known, but there is no doubt that it was one of the many original documents which were kept on the Capitol, only a few fragmentary specimens of which had hitherto been known, and those all now preserved in Naples. As Professor Gatti remarks, with justifiable pride, this is the only specimen of its kind now in Rome, and has fitly found a resting-place once more on the very hill where it was originally preserved.

THOMAS ASHBY.

## REVIEWS

### THE COINAGE OF THE AGE OF CONSTANTINE.

*Numismatique Constantinienne.* By JULES MAURICE. Paris: Leroux, 1908. Tome I. Pp. clxxix + 507. With 23 plates.

EUSEBIUS begins his life of Constantine the Great by an expression of his feelings as to the great and universal interest of the subject,

'for whether,' he says, 'I look to the East or the West, or cast my eyes over all the world, I see the blessed Emperor present everywhere.' Some such feeling may have been awakened in the breasts of numismatists who for several years past have been accustomed to note, in all the principal numismatic

periodicals of the world, the appearance of articles by M. Maurice dealing with the money that was used 'pendant la période Constantinienne.' Such articles have been welcomed as the first successful attempt to grapple in a scientific way with an enormously complicated mass of detail—types, mints, dates and legends—and also as being the evident outcome of widely extended numismatic research and of unusual knowledge of the political and financial history of the period during which the coins were issued.

There was one regret arising from M. Maurice's piece-meal method—no doubt inevitable—of publishing his studies: the whole series seemed in every sense of the word to require binding together, and needed a general introductory article which would summarize and explain results. But by the publication of the present exhaustive and amplified work the author has completely removed any such occasion of regret. In the volume before us (which will be followed by a second volume) we have first of all an Introduction which deals with the various denominations of the coinage and the constitution of the mints, and an elaborate chronology of the Constantine period, of which both the literary and the numismatic evidence form the basis. Then follows a long chapter on the imperial Iconography, and finally a detailed description of the coins struck at the various imperial mints. Of these mints there were no less than nineteen. In the first volume the output of the mints of Rome, Ostia, Aquileia, Carthage and Trèves is described; in the second, we shall have a description of the remaining fourteen mints and—may we hope?—a good index.

Any of us who have been prone to regard the coinage of Constantine as a conglomeration of somewhat banal types and heterogeneous legends may require M. Maurice's reminder that these coins were official issues, and that all the important acts of the imperial government are indicated by their legends or by the striking of special types and denominations. Thus, the date of the foundation of Constantinople—'le baptême de la nouvelle capitale'—may be fixed by the inscription CONST(antinopolis) which

is found in the exergue of coins struck in A.D. 324. The actual inauguration of the city, as city, is celebrated, after May 11, 330, by the issue of coins bearing the personification of Constantinople; and only after this date did the imperial court move to its new centre. Again, the celebration of imperial anniversaries is marked by the issue of coins with special types; and we have similar contemporary records of the visits of the Emperor to Rome, of meetings of Emperors, of victories over the barbarians, of the first appearance of a new Caesar or a new Augustus. But such types, however curious in themselves, only become fully instructive when they are arranged not merely according to subject, or, as in Cohen's work, alphabetically according to the legends, but *chronologically*. The determination of the chronology is thus of high importance, and is a salient feature of M. Maurice's monograph.

I am obliged to pass over the sections on denominations and on the highly elaborate constitution of the mints, though with regard to the latter it may be remarked that a principal characteristic of Diocletian's monetary reforms was his multiplication of mints. He found only eight in operation and set as many more in motion, some, indeed, only alternately. Under Constantine, the highest number reached was nineteen. M. Maurice has necessarily paid special attention to mint-marks and secret mint-marks—to the fairly obvious RP and RS, the first and second workshops (*prima, secunda, officina*) of the mint of Rome, and to more recondite marks like I and H, which, being interpreted, mean Jovius and Herculus, and refer to Diocletian and Maximian. Many Christian symbols seem also to figure as the symbols and secret-marks of mint-officials, when the times were favourable, as between the years 320 and 324, when Constantine legislated in favour of the Church.

The chronological lists are, as I have already indicated, minute and valuable, and include a list of the imperial titles as they vary from year to year, and these titles, brought together chronologically, set forth in firm outline the political changes of the period, and offer a welcome clue to the exits and entrances of the enormous *cast* of the



imperial drama. In 309 there were six Augusti, but an Emperor does not necessarily strike coins in the name of his colleagues, and the absence of coins is sometimes as instructive as their existence. For instance, Maxentius isolated in Italy, and Alexander at Carthage, strike only in their own names: Constantine strikes for all the four leading Augusti but not for Galerius, who had refused *him* the title of Augustus.

If the *Classical Review* were a purely numismatic periodical it would be desirable to extend considerably this notice of a book which furnishes invaluable material both to the historian and the student of coins; but it may be sufficient, in conclusion, to say something of the chapter that deals with portraiture, more especially as being likely to interest those readers who may not have followed M. Maurice's researches when they first appeared.

Most archaeological writers, including Cohen and Bernoulli, have remarked on the great difficulty, or impossibility, of ascertaining from coins the true portraiture of the Emperor Diocletian and his successors of the period of Constantine. M. Babelon, indeed, published a most enlightening study of the portraits of a later Emperor (Julian), but it has been reserved for M. Maurice to deal with the whole subject in detail, and, what is more, to discover the secret. The view that there are no true portraits discoverable on the coins seems at first sight to be justified by the fact that we find the most diverse effigies accompanied by the name of one and the same Emperor. But this apparent difficulty vanishes when the coins are carefully sorted (as by M. Maurice) under mints and periods. Then, it becomes evident that there was at least a method in the apparent vagaries of the different mint-masters in their choice of effigies. The whole subject is extremely complicated, but it may be made clear by observing what took place at the beginning of the period when this practice arose of putting forth a single effigy bearing the names of varying Emperors.

We are first on solid ground in the period 17 Nov. 284-1 April 285, when the Empire had but one ruler—Diocletian. Coins that belong to this period obviously

can give us only the portrait of Diocletian. But on 1 April 285 Diocletian took as colleague an 'Augustus' Maximian Hercules. The new Augustus had the West for his sphere, and accordingly in the Western mints we find a new head inscribed with Maximian's name. But in the Eastern mints, those within the sphere of Diocletian, we note that such coins as are issued with the name of Maximian are accompanied by the portrait of *Diocletian*. The Eastern mints not having received the model of Maximian's portrait presented Diocletian's, but at the same time recognized Maximian by encircling it with Maximian's name. So, then, the Western mints give us a true portrait of Maximian; the Eastern mints (in spite of their accompanying inscription) do not. With regard to the coins issued in the name of Diocletian during this period, we find the true portrait of that Emperor both in his own Eastern sphere and in the Western mints of Maximian, the reason for this being that Diocletian's effigy was already in use throughout all the imperial mints *before* the accession of Maximian.

Lastly, in order to carry the complication a little further, we pass on to the year 293, when to the two Augusti were added two Caesars, namely, Constantius Chlorus and Galerius. Each of these Caesars strikes coins in his own name and also in that of his colleague. But here, again, the name around the portrait does not invariably serve as the correct label. For Constantius, in his own mint of London, places his own head on all the coins, even on those struck in the name of Galerius; and, on the other hand, the coins struck by Galerius, in his own mint of Siscia, bear solely the effigy of Galerius, even in the case of coins struck by him in the name of his colleague Constantius. The reason for this substitution of portraits no doubt was that the mint-masters of the two Caesars did not exchange the Caesars' portraits, and had to be content with inscribing a name that did not belong to the portrait that they utilized. These clues to an apparent maze of portraiture having been obtained, it is possible to construct the real iconography of the Emperors and Caesars; and with respect to the general character of the por-

traits, M. Maurice remarks that the coins are not without artistic value, and that they are (apparently) fairly characteristic. An analysis (illustrated by the plates) of the portraiture of

each imperial personage brings all the details of the evidence before the reader.

WARWICK WROTH.

### 'DIVINI ELEMENTA POETAE.'

*Appendix Vergiliana.* Recognovit et adnotatione critica instruxit R. ELLIS. Oxonii: e Typ. Clarend. 1907. (Pages not numbered.)

*Poeti Latini Minori.* Testo Critico: Commentato: da G. CURCIO. Vol. ii, fasc. 2. *Appendix Vergiliana* (Dirae, Lydia, Ciris). Pp. 198 + xv. Catania: Battiato, 1908.

VERGIL'S '*Frühzeit*' has just now a peculiar fascination for Latin scholars: and whether the poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana* are or are not, any of them, Vergilian, they most of them belong to 'Vergil's *Frühzeit*,' and a respectable text of them is the necessary preliminary to a study of that fascinating period. This, thanks to Prof. Ellis, we now possess. The limitations of Ribbeck's text are well known. Baehrens' edition seems to be out of print; and, though Prof. Ellis pronounced it on its appearance to be a great advance on Ribbeck, I have never been able to see that, save in the direction of simplification (in the Apparatus), Baehrens did any great service to the text of the pseudo-Vergiliana, apart from the clever and certain correction, *coccina* for *cognita*, at *Ciris* 169. In any case Prof. Ellis' text will at once supersede its predecessors. Not only are his collations new (correcting those of other scholars at a great many points), but his recension has been made with great tact and prudence, and with that consideration for others from which alone can be born a workable text. Indeed, as a textual critic Prof. Ellis is perhaps here seen at his best. In emendation he has never been more felicitous, and that in poems where scholars like Scaliger constantly dissatisfy, and where Sillig is probably as successful as anyone. Among emendations of Ellis' which I think certain are *Ciris* 321 *præes sit* (for *pressit*): 323

*commenta: Moretum* 15 *plausa* (for *clausa*): *Culex* 62 *feruent* (*fuertint* codd.), 140 *fleta* (*laeta* codd.), 274 *efossasque*. And scattered up and down the Apparatus are a number of less certain conjectures, which I should pronounce superior to those of previous editors. Some suggestions do not appeal: as the notion of an old English gloss *ēgor* at *Ciris* 481: *ibidem* 249 *scora*: *Culex* 221 *lurent* (a word which Mr. Housman introduces into Ovid, but which is otherwise strange to the best Latin poets). At *Ciris* 218 Ellis retains '*nulantia sidera mundi*,' but it can hardly bear the sense 'bickering' which he gives to it (*A.J.P.* xv. p. 479). The stars are part of a *convexo* '*nutans pondere mundus* (*Ecl.* iv. 50). At 303 *ibid.* the view (which seems to me certain: so too Prof. Hardie) that a line has been lost at least deserved mention. At *Culex* 264 V's *ā* points, I think, not to *causa* (Ellis), but merely to the *cura* of the other MSS.: *ā* as a contraction for *cura* is found also at Tibullus 3. 2. 25.

In the selection of MSS. upon which to base his texts Ellis has followed a middle course. He has not overwhelmed us with the readings of MSS. worth nothing; and he has at the same time given the student of the text as much as he can want. It is in the *Culex* that he is perhaps most open to criticism.<sup>1</sup> To my mind, we could quite well have dispensed with the readings of G and Γ. Their claims to independent value seems to me to rest solely on 51, where Ellis, with them, reads *ripis*. But even here the parallel which Skutsch cites from Ovid *Rem. Am.* 178-180 tells strongly in favour of *rupes*. F again adds nothing of value to B. With regard to Vossianus 81 (Voss.), I do not quite understand Ellis' position. Baehrens

<sup>1</sup> This was written before the appearance of Mr. Housman's paper on the MSS. of the *Culex*.

perceived the great worth of this late MS. But, since Baehrens, the value of Voss. has very much gone down, owing to Ellis' discovery of V, an earlier and better MS. to which Voss. is very closely related. Is Voss. (in the *Culex*) a copy of (or directly derived from) V? If it is, we can at once dismiss it. If it is not, its every variant is worth citing. Ellis cites it only rarely. Yet at 237, 269 (*pene* Voss. = *paenene*: Ellis does not note this), 273, 308, 340, 378, 379, Voss. alone has the true reading, and V has lost it. These passages constitute a strong claim to independence, and seem to me to entitle Voss. to a greater consideration than Ellis has allowed it. In some places Ellis has failed to record the reading of V, so that a comparison with Voss. is often not possible. On the whole, I incline to think that Ellis would have given us a better and simpler text of *Culex*, if he had confined himself to B and V with Voss. Cors. Cant. But many people will no doubt dissent from this; and everyone will agree that in Ellis' edition of the *Appendix* as a whole we have the only readable text that exists.

The most important part of Curcio's book is the *Ciris*. In his text of the *Ciris* Curcio employs (though he had not seen Ellis' work) the same six MSS. as Ellis, though Ellis is wiser in that 'parcius adhibuit' Curcio's H and L. Curcio's Apparatus is far less compact and readable than Ellis'; and, as a textual critic, he has not much of his own to offer. Often I think his judgment rather wooden: e.g. 155 *furando* for *iurando* is not bright: why not finish, and write *fure* for *iure*? At 185 the retention of *serum* is hardly credible. At the same time Curcio's text, though his judgment is often thus stiff and heavy, is a careful and meritorious piece of work. The Commentary is slight and disappointing. Such notes as those at 5-7, 63, 88—to take three much vexed passages—not only do not explain, they do not even state, the difficulties. Some notes again are otiose: e.g. 46 (where,

if a note was wanted at all, it was worth mentioning that the phrase, *multum uigilata*, is found outside the *Ciris*): 165 *Edonum*: 226 *sanguine suffundit*. Such notes, once more, as 108 *recrepat*: 'transitive,' are not very scholarly. The most interesting portion of the volume is the Introductions. They put one in possession of most of the problems raised by the poems, and, if the author is rather loth to make up his own mind about anything, he yet gives the reader the materials for forming an independent judgment. The sections in *Dirae* and *Lydia*, as well as in *Ciris*, on Language, Style, Affinity with other poets, Metre, etc., are all skilful and useful work. In particular, the table of affinities between *Ciris* and other Latin poets is a great improvement on that of Baehrens, though often (e.g. *Dirae* 80 = *Ecl.* 9. 2) Curcio sees borrowing where there is none. Reviewing at length Skutsch's contentions as to the authorship of *Ciris* (with Leo's rejoinder) Curcio himself pronounces for an unknown author. Let me offer here one suggestion *pro* Skutsch and *contra* Leo. Leo urges that *Eclogue* vi cannot be a catalogue of Gallus' poems, because it is addressed to Varus. But Servius knows of ancient critics who held that *Ecl.* vi. originally stood first in Virgil's collection. In that case,

(1) *Ecl.* vi. (as the first in the book) is naturally concerned with Gallus' poems, since Gallus was Virgil's only predecessor in the Latin Idyll or *Eclogue*.

(2) The introductory lines to Varus are not so much an Introduction to *Ecl.* vi. as a dedication of the whole volume. Moreover, the story—whatever its historical value—that this *Eclogue* was recited in the theatre by Cytheris = Lycoris at least shows that at a very early period it was regarded as a poem in honour of Gallus. I notice these points because I have not seen them noticed elsewhere, and because Curcio's volume hardly does full justice to Skutsch's theory.

H. W. GARROD.

## INDOGERMANIC NUMERALS.

*Die Distributiven und die Kollektiven Numeralia der Indogermanischen Sprachen.* Von K. BRUGMANN. Mit einem Anhang von EDUARD SIEVERS. Altnordisch tvenn(i)r þrenn(i)r, fernir, from Vol. XXV. of the 'Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.' Leipzig: D. G. Teubner, 1907. M. 3.60.

THIS work is of great interest both to the student of Comparative Philology in its exposition of the origin and use of these numerals in the Indogermanic languages, and also to the Classical student in its clear statements of many points in Greek and Latin usage, which have hitherto been only too vaguely apprehended; in particular several difficult uses of the so-called distributives (*bini*, etc.) are explained by a careful consideration of their collective origin. The main results of the book are the following. The true distributives are first dealt with. Here Brugmann finds three principles:

(i) The Iterative. Skr. *eka ekas* is the type. Class. Gk. *μία μία* (*δύο δύο* etc. are later). As a later development forms joined by 'and' are found, e.g. O.E. *twaem ond twaem*.

(ii) The use with a pronoun: Gk. *ἐς ἕκαστος*. Lat. *unus quisque*. Irish *cach oen*, 'quisque unus.'

(iii) The use with prepositions: Skr. *prati*, e.g. *praty ekam*, 'one by one.' Gk. *κατὰ, ἀνὰ* etc. The Gk. *κατὰ* through its use in Patristic Latin comes out in Romance, e.g. Ital. *cada uno*, 'one by one.'

Connected with (iii) is the use of the Vedic suffix *-sas*, e.g. Skr. *eka-sas*, 'one by one.' There can be little doubt that it is identical with Gk. *-κας* in *ἐ-κας*, *ἀνδρα-κας*. With regard to its origin, which is disputed, Brugmann's theory is that it is from *†kens* from a root *kens*- seen in Lat. *censēo*, Gk. *κόσμος* from *†κοσμος*. Vedic *sāsa-ti* 'counts,'—so that the original meaning was 'according to a fixed measure or order,'—seems likely to be the true one. Possibly

the form itself was once really an Imperative 'count one,' 'count two.'

In dealing with the Collective numerals (under this heading are included (1) forms which have both the Collective meaning and a later acquired Distributive meaning, and also (2) forms which though Collective in origin have become merely Distributive), Brugmann first considers the formative elements;—three in number, *-o*, *-no* and *-go* added to the cardinal.

(i) The forms in *-o*; Indg. *†dueio-*, *†dūeió-*; *treiό-*, *troiό-*; *-bheio-*, *-bhoio*. Vedic adj. *dvaya-s*, 'two-fold'; subst. *dvayam*, 'duplicity'; *traya-s*, 'three-fold'; *ubhaya-s*, 'both.' Lat. *bes* and *bessis*, *†be[ɛ]-essis* from *dueio-* with elision of the last vowel of the stem, so *tressis* from *†treio-essis*; *†quetuero*, *quetuoro*. In Aryan only found in the Vedic substantive *catvārd-m*.

As regards the Lat. *decuria*, Brugmann dismisses Schulze's conjecture of a stem *†deku-*, and advances a theory which can hardly be doubted, namely that the form arose analogically from *†q<sup>ue</sup>tur-iū*; so that while the ending *-eriū* spread to '5,' e.g. Unbr. *pumperiā*, in the form *-uriū* it spread to '10' and '100.'

(ii) The forms in *-no*:

*bini* from *†bisno-*; *terni* from *†trisinno-*; *quaterni* from *†quatrino-* (or analogical after *terni*?); *sēni* from *†secsno-*; *quini* from *quincino-*; *septēni* from *†septensno-*; *octoni* from *†octōsno-*; *noueni* from *†novensno-* (probably the *-sno-* form of the suffix started from *†bisno-*, *†trisinno-*, *†secsno-*).

With regard to the forms for 'seven,' 'eight' and 'nine'; regularly we should have *†septino-* becoming *†sesno-* and that *†seno-*; *†octino-* becoming *†osno-* and that *†ōno-*, *†nounsno-* becoming *nuno-*. Clearly forms which were so far from the cardinal and in which, moreover, the expressions for 'six' and 'seven' had become identical, were not likely to survive. The survival of *deni* may be due partly to the fact that it appeared also in the forms *undeni*, *duodeni*; moreover,



it was not likely to be confused with any other number.

As regards the double forms *terni* and *trini*, *quaterni* and *quadrini*, Brugmann points out that they are distinguished in use; *terni*, *quaterni* are used as Distributives, though the Collective function is not entirely foreign to them; *trini*, *quadrini*, are used as Collectives. Bini combines both these functions and for it Brugmann postulates a double origin;—in its acquired use as Distributive from †*duisno*-, as Collective from †*duino* or †*dueino*-. From †*bisnoi*, †*trisnoi*, the -sno suffix as we have seen passed to the numbers from '5' onwards, and these acquired a distributive meaning at the same time as †*bisnoi* etc., without however losing their collective meaning. The form *alterni* might have had some influence in the use of *terni*, *quaterni* as Distributives. Corresponding to †*duisno* is O.H.G. *zwirnēn*, *zwirnon*. To †*duino*- and †*trino*- correspond O.H.G. *zwinal*, *zwinel*, *zwenel*, 'gemellus' and Mod. H.G. *drell*, 'linen woven with three threads.' If a criticism may be ventured, these German forms seem rather a slight basis for the creation of †*dueino*- as well as †*duisno*-.

(iii) -qo- forms are represented in Vedic Skt. *dvikas*, 'aus Zweien bestehend' and O.H.G. *zwisk*, 'zweifach.'

In discussing the various uses of the Collective and Distributive forms, Brugmann brings forward many interesting points.

Forms in -o, -no and -qo had or acquired a Collective meaning outside the numerals,

e.g. Skt. *asvam* beside *asvas*, Gk. ἵππικόν beside ἵππος; these Collective nouns are, like the numerals, neuter. As regards the use of †(*d*)*ēmito*-m, '100' (where it is an elliptical expression for a 'ten of tens'), Brugmann notes that it is found in its original meaning of 'a group of ten' in Gothic, *sibuntē hund* etc., 'a ten of sevens,' i.e. 70. In Aryan and Slavonic this neuter numeral is found with a genitive plural (in Aryan appearing as a compound, e.g. Skt. *go-dvayam*), but in both these groups we find the adjective use of the numeral as well, while in Italic and Germanic the substantive is only used absolutely, the adjective supplying its place in other cases. Both these constructions are probably Indogermanic, the substantive use was the earlier.

Lastly, the Distributive use is treated: the question is how Latin came to prefer the Collective in this use to the Cardinal and to make it the rule; in Greek we find a parallel use of *ὀν* with the Cardinal, where the explanation is as doubtful as that of the use of *bini* etc. in Latin. It is in Latin only that the Collective is regularly used as Distributive; in the other Indg. languages it is only an occasional phenomenon.

In discussing the Gk. *δοιοί* and *δοίω* Brugmann inclines to think that they too were collective in origin, and this seems very probable, although the evidence is not sufficient to afford a proof. One can only say in conclusion that this is a work which fully repays the most careful study and consideration.

S. E. JACKSON.

#### PURITY IN GREEK AND LATIN STYLE.

*Latinitas and Ἑλληνισμός.* By C. N. SMILEY. Wisconsin, 1906.

THE author of this thesis attempts to estimate the influence of the 'Stoic theory of style,' as seen in the writings of Dionysius, Quintilian, Pliny the Younger, Tacitus, Fronto, Aulus Gellius, and Sextus Empiricus. His purpose is to show that the Stoic theory persisted as a strong literary influence at

Rome for a period of two hundred years after the death of Cicero, and that it was always at war with what he terms the 'Ciceronian or rhetorical' style.

The whole question of Ἑλληνισμός is, as the author knows, beset by many uncertainties. The first enunciation of a doctrine of the kind is supposed to be found in Diogenes Laertius' life of Zeno (vii. 59), where it is attributed to Diogenes the Stoic

of Babylon and teacher of Panaetius: 'Ἀρεταὶ δὲ λόγον εἰσὶ πέντε' Ἑλληνισμός, σαφήνεια, συντομία, πρέπον, κατασκευή. Ἑλληνισμός μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος ἐν τῇ τεχνικῇ καὶ μὴ εἰκαῖα συνηθεία. σαφήνεια δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις γνωρίμως παριστῶσα τὸ νοούμενον. συντομία δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις αὐτὰ τὰ ἀνυγκαῖα περιέχουσα πρὸς δῆλωσιν τοῦ πράγματος. πρέπον δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις οἰκεία τῷ πράγματι. κατασκευή δὲ ἐστὶ λέξις ἐκπεφυγνῖα τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν. Mr. Smiley suggests that the reason why the first virtue gave its name to the theory as a whole was that it includes all the others. But, to waive other difficulties, the inclusion of κατασκευή in the list is unexpected, if κατασκευή be understood in its ordinary sense, as the definition λέξις ἐκπεφυγνῖα τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν (together with Herodian's κυριολογία and εὐσυνθεσία) seems clearly to prove that it should be. In fact, Ἑλληνισμός becomes so comprehensive a quality that the possession of it, or of its Latin counterpart, would assuredly be claimed by the eclectic Cicero, who does not fail to see that pure Latin must be the basis of all elegance in style: 'neque enim conamur docere eum dicere, qui loqui nesciat; nec sperare, qui Latine non possit, hunc ornate esse dicturum (*de Orat.* iii. 10, 38).'

With regard to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the author rightly says that he disapproved of any adornment of style for which purity, precision, clearness, or conciseness must be sacrificed,—that he preferred, in Attic oratory, the simple style of Lysias to the embellished style of Isocrates. But what we miss is any proof that, in referring so often to καθὰ ἑρμηνεία and the like, Dionysius admits that he is following in Stoic footsteps. He does, indeed, mention

(*de Isocr.* c. 13) that, among others, the Stoic dialectician Philonicus had criticised certain wearisome features in the style of Isocrates. But elsewhere (*de Comp. Verb.* c. 4) he expresses great disappointment with the Stoics, regarded not as dialecticians or grammarians but as authorities on the artistic arrangement of words; and yet εὐσυνθεσία is supposed, as we have seen, to have formed part of the Stoic doctrine of style. The general impression left upon the mind is that, though there are many points of contact between the writings of Dionysius and what is represented as the Stoic theory of style, Dionysius himself felt that, in these matters, he was following a longer and higher tradition than the Stoic.

The question, however, needed discussion; and it has been well discussed by Mr. Smiley. If space allowed, it would be pleasant to follow him in the pages he devotes to the other authors on his list. Whether we agree with his conclusions or not, his treatment of the points at issue is full of interest and suggestion, and exhibits that wide and sound knowledge of ancient rhetoric which might be expected in a pupil of Professor G. L. Hendrickson. Rhetorical studies seem to have a wide vogue in America. And this is all to the good, so long as a knowledge of the technique of literature aids rather than impedes the appreciation and production of literature itself. The terms Ἑλληνισμός and *Latinitas* should, at all events, suggest that, in our own common language, there is a purity to guard, and one all the more worth guarding when that language is still at the height of its vigour and its influence.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

#### THE RELIGIOUS ENVIRONMENT OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

*Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments: Die Abhängigkeit des ältesten Christentums von nichtjüdischen Religionen und philosophischen Systemen zusammenfassend untersucht von* PROF. LIC. DR.

CARL CLEMEN. Mit 12 Abbildungen auf zwei Tafeln. Pp. viii, 301. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1909. Price 10 M.

AMONG the questions which at present engage the attention of New Testament

students, one of the most important is certainly that of reconstructing the religious environment in which primitive Christianity developed and tracing its influence on the new religion. It is of course a commonplace that the Gospel, both as proclaimed by Jesus and in the form given to it by the original Apostles and Paul, was largely dependent on the religion of Israel and the contemporary Judaism. That Jesus Himself was indebted to foreign sources has been generally denied by those most competent to express an opinion. And the Old Testament and the simple piety of the common people were far more important factors in His religious training than Jewish scholasticism. But while the primitive Gospel was untouched by influences from abroad, these influences began to play on the religion at a pretty early point. It can hardly be denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews owes its fundamental conception to the Jewish Platonism of Alexandria, and many scholars would say the same of the Logos doctrine in the Fourth Gospel, though others would put in a claim for the Hermetic literature. It has for long been keenly debated whether Paul was much indebted to Greek thought.

But recently the question has entered on a new phase. A band of very able and enthusiastic scholars, of whom Gunkel, Bousset, and Heitmüller may be named as among the most active, explain much in the New Testament as due directly or indirectly to the religious syncretism of the time. The astral religion of Babylonia, the dualism of Persia, the mystical cults of Asia Minor and the theology of Egypt had been blended together, and possibly India itself had contributed to the amalgam. Scholars are divided on the question whether Christianity borrowed from these directly or indirectly. Dieterich, for example, found no difficulty in supposing that the story of the heavenly woman, the dragon and the man-child, which we read in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, was simply borrowed from the similar story of the birth of Apollo. Gunkel, on the contrary, argued that the writer could not have consciously taken over a myth in this way from

heathenism. He assumed accordingly that it had come to him through Judaism, having passed through a long process of purification in that religion. He postulated a Babylonian origin for the myth. The story of the persecution of the mother of the sun-god by the dragon of chaos and darkness with the birth and triumph of the sun-god seems to have been very widespread. This is a sample of what the advocates of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Methode* as it is called apply to a great deal of the New Testament. For example, they consider that the advanced Christological dogma which we find in the Pauline Epistles can be accounted for only on the theory that a very developed Messianic theology had already been formed in Judaism and, since the Christians regarded Jesus as the Messiah, was transferred by them to Him without more ado.

Inasmuch then as the exponents of this method are extremely active in Germany, and the question is among the most important that can engage the student of Christian origins, Clemen's work deserves a very warm welcome. He is himself a very eminent theologian who has gained his reputation not only in the field of the New Testament but of Systematic and Practical Theology. He has more familiarity with non-German literature than most of his countrymen, and he has done a good deal of work in the study of Comparative Religion. His book is excellently planned, and in spite of some lacunae shows remarkable familiarity with the relevant literature. The general principles which he lays down are thoroughly sound; indeed were it not that experience shows how lightly they are transgressed, one could have imagined that some of them might have been left to native common sense without explicit formulation. The introduction briefly sketches the history and defines the method of this type of investigation and then deals with its presuppositions. The body of the book falls into two main divisions, a general and a special. The former, after a discussion of the question as it affects Christianity in general, examines the individual doctrines and rites, first those borrowed from Judaism

and then those that are specifically Christian. The special portion deals first with the life and teaching of Jesus, paying particular attention to the infancy narratives, then with the Pauline, and finally with the Johannine theology. When we remember how in this subject in particular far-reaching hypotheses have been erected on the flimsiest evidence we may well be grateful for a work so cautious in its method, so free from prejudice and desire to make out a case, so

moderate in its conclusions. If a word of criticism may be permitted on this painstaking and balanced enquiry it would be that on some points needless concessions are made to the method which he submits to such careful examination. In view of the really wild statements which are industriously circulated in England at the present time it would be a good thing if the book could be translated.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

### CICERO'S FOURTH VERRINE ORATION.

*Cicero's Fourth Verrine Oration.* Richter-Eberhard, revised (4th edition) by HERMANN NOHL. Teubner, 1908.

(*Cicero's Rede gegen C. Verres.* Viertes Buch für den Schul- und Privat-Gebrauch erklärt von Fr. Richter und Alfred Eberhard in Vierter Auflage bearbeitet von Hermann Nohl.)

THIS is an up-to-date edition of a useful and well-known volume. Apart from the commentary, the most valuable feature of the work is H. Nohl's critical appendix, consisting of 14 closely printed pages, in which the editor undertakes to say to advanced students the last word that can be said on the problems of the text. With these he shows a thorough familiarity. It is perhaps a little odd that the appendix should be introduced by a somewhat obsolete 'stemma' of the MSS.—very slightly altered from that which appeared in Nohl's edition of 1885. If this were the place for proof, it could easily be shown that G<sup>1</sup>, for example, does not deserve the place which Nohl continues to assign to it in his classification (v. *Journ. Phil.* xxx. p. 183). And indeed there is no longer any reason—as the editor seems himself to have realised in practice—for citing G<sup>1</sup>, G<sup>2</sup>, Ld. at all in connection with the detailed criticism of Books IV. and V. They have been superseded by the identification of their first parent S (Par. 7775). Of this MS., however, Nohl has little to say that is good. He considers it a copy of R (Reg. Par. 7774 A), and pronounces it to be 'für die Kritik der 4 Rede wertlos.' After this *ex cathedra* pronouncement, it may well surprise even a casual reader to find that Nohl's practice does not accord with his theory, and that, as a matter of fact, he almost invariably cites the readings of S, as given in the Oxford text, along with those of R. The citations are in the main correct, though there is a wrong attribution in § 102 (*at minime mirum* S) and *ex iis* S must be a misprint at § 106. On the other hand, the authority of S should have been invoked for *at videte* § 151 as it is for *modo ut bona ratione* § 10, *ipsi se* § 87, and elsewhere.

The excuse for Nohl's attitude to S is that he is dealing with S only so far as the Fourth Book is concerned. This sort of piecemeal work has of course its disadvantages: it is just as if a student were to attempt to deal with the criticism of the Verrines as a whole, though competent in only a portion of the text. Considering, however, that the emergence of S has sufficed to banish from his critical apparatus all references to G<sup>1</sup>, G<sup>2</sup> and Ld., of which he made so considerable a use in his first edition (1885), Nohl need not have protested so strongly against the statement that S 'must be elevated to the very first rank among MSS. of the Verrines.' His view that S has no authority independently of R may be compared with the facts as set forth in *J. Ph.* xxx. pp. 195 *sqq.* And even if S were merely, as Nohl thinks, a copy of R, and therefore practically superfluous for Books IV. and V. (where R still exists) it is different in the case of the earlier books, which no longer form part of R. For these books (*i.e.* the *Divinatio*, the *Actio Prima*, and Lib. I.) S gives the key to the whole situation, along with its copy D, and the mention of this fact—so carefully ignored by Nohl—should be enough to justify the place claimed for it by recent students of the text of the Verrines as a whole (v. *J. Ph.* xxx. 163 *sqq.*).

A good deal of Nohl's otherwise laudable endeavour to secure a true text is spoiled by his inability to understand a point of view that differs from his own. He becomes in places even satirical. I take as an instance § 125. The mistake of attributing *erant* to the MSS. instead of *erat* was made by Nohl himself and will be found on p. 63 of his 1885 edition. In this error he was preceded by Eberhard, and followed by C. F. W. Müller: it is repeated even in the Halm-Laubmann edition (1906). Now that Nohl has reminded us that, as stated already in the Zürich edition, the MS. reading is *erat*, not *erant*, there is all the less reason for deleting the words to which most German editors have taken exception in this part of the speech—*quod erat eius modi ut semel vidisse satis esset*. They may even be made to serve



as a lesson in construing. Nohl asks incredulously 'Worauf soll sich der Sing. (*erat*) beziehen'? The answer is to be found in the *id* at the end of the paragraph. Perhaps the following method of setting forth a disputed passage may commend the MS. reading to impartial students:

'Etiamne gramineas hastas—vidi enim vos in hoc nomine, cum testis diceret, commoveri: quod erat eius modi ut semel vidisse satis esset, (in quibus . . . plus quam semel) etiam id concupisti?'

A similar inability to allow for the anacolutha of what may have been intended to represent rapid rhetorical utterance (such as is exemplified in the accusative *gramineas hastas* in the passage just quoted) and a tendency to standardise, as it were, all such passages by the application of a schoolmaster's rules of grammar may be discovered in Nohl's note on § 127 where the only explanation (*Cl. Rev.* xviii. p. 211) which stands by the manuscript tradition (*quod . . . certe non sustulisset*) is contemptuously rejected. This passage may be noted also as illustrating a much-needed improvement in German editions of Latin texts. It is difficult to over-estimate the harm that has been done to learners by the abuse of commas. A German will never say, with Cicero, *si quis eorum qui adsunt forte miratur*; he will insist, with Nohl, on a comma after *eorum*, and another after *adsunt*. This sort of thing has always seemed to me to obscure the fact that the words inter-punctuated (here *eorum qui adsunt*) form a single concept. In the last sentence of the passage under consideration, Nohl's 1908 edition has *Nunc enim, quod scriptum est inani in basi, declarat quid fuerit*. This is bad enough, but not so bad as the editor's previous texts, where one more comma is inserted after *declarat*. There is therefore some progress here in the matter of commas, just as there is at § 36 where Nohl now prints *componere hoc quod postulo*, instead of with a comma after *hoc*, as he did in 1907. But it ought to be obvious that, on any rational system of punctuation, the construction of the sentence quoted above from § 127 should not be obscured by any commas at all.

It would be comparatively profitless to contrast Nohl's latest edition with the excellent school text which he published in 1885: the field of criticism has been largely extended since that date, and valuable results have been obtained which are now common property. But as recently as 1907 Nohl produced a third and revised edition of his earlier work, (Freytag, Leipzig). He was probably not so well-served then as he is now in the latest results of criticism, and it is interesting to compare what he puts forward as final in 1908 with readings to which he had given the authority of his name in the year immediately preceding. Thus he now reads *eius modi* (§ 6) for *huius modi*: *modo ut* (§ 10) for *modo*: at § 22 he restores to the text, though evidently with

hesitation, the passage *ita C. Cato—aestimata est*, which he had previously omitted: at § 25 he reads *locupletissima et amplissima* instead of as formerly *locupletissima*: § 36 *hic iudices* in place of *hosce iud.*: § 43 *despoliaretur si emeraset quid erat quod*, etc., instead of *despoliaretur? Si emeraset quid erat quod*. This improvement Nohl attributes, by the way, to Baiter, whereas it is really the reading given by Lambinus. In § 48 words previously omitted are restored to the text—*de patellis pateris turibulis*: § 54 a change for the worse is made at the opening of the section, where there should be no parenthesis, the construction being obviously consecutive,—*ne existimetis . . . videte*, etc.: *ibid. et pateris* is added to the text, and *interim* is substituted for the MS. *tamen*: § 67 *id sibi—abstulisse* is quite rightly substituted, in accordance with MS. authority, for the *id ab se—abstulisse* of previous editions: § 102 *unam eligam* for *eligam*: § 104 *legibus ac for legibus aut*: § 122 *picta praeclare* for *picta*: § 124 *cludendum* for *claudendum*: § 128 Schlenger is rightly cited: in 1907 he was called Schlenge (Vorrede to the Freytag edition, p. 4): § 144 *istius* is altered to *fuisse* (after *commonefaceret*, to vouch for which reading the despised and rejected S is cited as well as p). Most of these changes are improvements and their adoption since the publication of the 1907 edition is an indication that Nohl has profited by the recent work of other students of the Verrines.

Nohl lays claim to the most scrupulous accuracy, even in matters of detail. He goes so far as to chronicle the fact (p. 162) that whereas the Richter-Eberhard 3rd edition, which he is revising, has '*pervenit res ad istius aures, nescio quo modo*' he has decided (quite correctly) to omit the comma. But his critical appendix is by no means free from errors, of which the following may be cited as examples: § 14 *si libidini non feceris* is wrongly credited to Madvig: it occurs in the *Leidensis*: § 29 '*tuam a . . . istius β*.' This is exactly the opposite of the fact, *tuam* being found in p̄ (β) and *istius* in RS (α): § 35 *ut* is given in the notes, but the text has not been altered to correspond, and *uti* still appears: § 55 *de istius pallio* is credited to Zumpt, though there is MS. authority for the reading: § 64 the references should be 3, 77 and 3, 129 instead of 2, 77 and 2, 129: § 104 the last note (*has in his*) is wrongly included in this section, and should be transferred to § 106: § 107 *deklararant* is a misprint for *deklararunt*: § 140 the note '*illius a, istius β*' is misplaced, it should come first in the section: § 146 the note on *aliqui* is also in the wrong order, it ought to precede that on *P. Caesetius*.

W. PETERSON.

*M<sup>c</sup>Gill University, Montreal,  
March, 1909.*

## SEDULIUS SCOTTUS, AND JOHANNES SCOTTUS.

*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters.* Herausgegeben von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Vol. I. Part 1. 'Sedulius Scottus,' von S. HELLMANN, Privatdozent der Geschichte an der Universität München. Pp. 203. M. 8. 50. Part 2. 'Johannes Scottus,' von E. K. RAND, Assistant Professor of Latin at Harvard University. Munich: Beck, 1906. Pp. 106. M. 6.

THE above works are the first two parts of the series of studies in mediaeval Latin philology founded by the lamented paleographer and mediaevalist, Ludwig Traube of Munich. Both of them came to the knowledge of the present writer immediately after their publication, but it was only recently that he was requested to review them. The first deals with Sedulius Scottus, the Irishman of Liège, who was copying a Greek Psalter, and writing Latin verses founded on Virgil, Ovid and Fortunatus, about the middle of the ninth century. It begins with the first completely satisfactory text of the *Liber de rectoribus Christianis*, a noteworthy contribution to the political philosophy of the Middle Ages, dedicated to Lothar II about 855-9. It is written in prose intermingled with sets of verse in various metres after the model of the *Philosophiae Consolatio* of Boëthius, from whom the author borrows directly when he prefaces his first set of verses with the following sentence: 'haec quae breviter stilo prosali diximus, aliqua versuum dulcedine concludamus.' To the classical scholar the interest of his work lies in the reminiscences of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, as well as of Virgil and Ovid. The following is a favourable specimen of his Sapphics:

Quid valet flavi nitor omnis auri,  
Ostra quid prosunt rosei decoris,  
Gloriae quid sunt Scythicaeque gemmae,  
Quid diadema,

Orba si mentis acies hebescat,  
Lumen ut verum nequeat tueri,  
Unde discernat bona prava justa,  
Fasque nefasque?

Next follows an important monograph on the *Collectaneum* in the library at Cues on the Mosel, which first attracted the notice of scholars when it was announced that it included certain new fragments of Cicero's orations *In Pisonem* and *Pro Fonteio*. It also included excerpts from the *Scriptores Historiae*

*Augustae*, and it was ultimately proved by Traube that this miscellaneous MS was the commonplace-book of Sedulius. His knowledge of Vegetius may be due to the Irish colony at Laon, while that of Valerius Maximus may be ascribed to non-Irish influence at Stavelot, S.E. of Liège, and that of Cicero may have come from MSS at Louvain or Liège, where (it will be remembered) Petrarch discovered a copy of Cicero's speech *Pro Archia* in 1333. The editor adds Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* to the works known to Sedulius; he also shows that the orthographical peculiarities of the *Collectaneum* are mainly of Irish origin, and draws the same inference in the case of the Latin *Proverbia Graecorum* included in it.

Dr. Rand's contribution to the series contains the text of two anonymous Commentaries on the *Opuscula Sacra*, now accepted as the genuine works of Boëthius. The author of the first is identified by Dr. Rand as Johannes Scottus, and that of the second as Remigius of Auxerre. This identification proves that, about 870 (a date approximately referred to in the first Commentary), John the Scot was still in Frankland and had not returned to England. It also shows that, so far from his being a resolute opponent of Boëthius (as supposed, for example, in Mr. H. F. Stewart's interesting essay on that author), he was actually in general agreement with him. He knows his Virgil, but he is not a humanist like Eric of Auxerre, the commentator on Juvenal and Persius, who supplies us with the earliest evidence of the influence of the study of Horace's *Odes* in France. Dr. Rand clearly shows that John the Scot had no sympathy with a purely humanistic devotion to the study of the classics, but that he is the prophetic precursor of the scholastic controversies of the Middle Ages. A large part of Dr. Rand's work lies outside the immediate province of the *Classical Review*, but it presents us with an admirable example of precise and scholarly method applied to the solution of intricate literary problems, and Harvard may be congratulated on having a scholar of his wide interests among the members of its professorial staff.

Both of these works should be studied closely by any one who wishes to form an accurate conception of the important place taken by Irishmen such as Sedulius of Liège and John the Scot in the intellectual life of the ninth century in Europe.

J. E. SANDYS.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Dictionnaire Étymologique du Latin et du Grec dans ses Rapports avec le Latin d'après la Méthode Évolutionniste.* Par PAUL REGNAUD, Professeur de Sanscrit et de Grammaire comparée à l'Université de Lyon. Paris: Librairie E. Leroux. Fr. 10.

THIS work, which shows a high degree of industry, is unhappily distinguished by clumsy arrangement and an absolute disregard of phonetic laws. It is only necessary to quote one or two examples. Under *poena* we have no mention of the fact that the retention of an 'oe' diphthong in an unaccented syllable in Latin is irregular. Similarly under *bos* no mention is made of the fact that the pure Latin form would be *tuos*, and that *bos* must therefore be a dialect word. Under *igitur* we have 'étymologie très incertaine—Peut-être pour *tecc-itus* combinaison de *tecc*, *ecce* et de l'adv. ablatif *titus*.' Comment would be wasted. The *méthode évolutionniste*, whatever it may be, has no relation to the scientific study of language.

S. E. JACKSON.

*Le Rappresentanze Figurate delle Provincie Romane.* By MICHELE JATTA. Pp. 86. With 4 colliotype plates and 12 illustrations. Roma: Loescher. 1908. 8 lire.

SIGNOR JATTA's brochure is a useful piece of work. It consists of a careful enumeration of the monuments, with notes on the types of the personifications of provinces and their development, and on their dependence on the types of cities and countries in pre-Roman art. That art, he concludes, shows but small creative power in respect to the conception and types of the personified provinces, the scenes represented and the attributes employed. And yet, if they are regarded as a whole, and their attributes considered as the expression of a political and economic idea, they reveal a life all their own, and present an artistic phenomenon quite foreign to earlier art, and capable of giving a Roman stamp to the old elements that constitute them. That, we may remark,

is a conclusion which may be applied to the monuments of Roman art as a whole. The illustrations are good and interesting; perhaps one, instead of five, of the medallions from the Zeugma mosaic would have sufficed, since they are purely conventional.

G. F. HILL.

British Museum.

*Ménandre: l'Arbitrage.* MAURICE CROISSET. Paris, 1908. Pp. 93. Fr. 2.50.

MR. CROISSET, who assisted in the *editio princeps* of the new fragments, has now edited the scenes of the *Epitrepontes* separately with critical and general notes and a translation of his own. The critical notes are brought well up to date by containing many of Körte's conclusions from the papyrus, and the commentary is brief and serviceable. A reviewer is bound in duty to add that the editor's knowledge of things is not always to be trusted. It throws an unwelcome light on the state of Greek scholarship in France, if a leading and distinguished scholar can think that a dactyl is admissible in the second foot of an iambic verse and a spondee in the fourth (οὐδὲν γὰρ γλυκύτερόν ἐστιν ἢ πάντ' εἶδέναι and ἀλλ' ἀπαγαγεῖν παρ' ἀνδρὸς σοῦ τὴν θυγατέρα). It would have been painful to Cobet to find the former verse actually ascribed to him, for Croiset fails to notice that he omitted γάρ. It is an equal error at 517 to attribute a spondee in the second foot to Headlam. ἔστε *until* should not have been introduced into the text of the prosaic Menander. Herodotus uses it, and so does Xenophon, who is often unattic; but otherwise it is poetical and not to be found in comedy, even in lyrics. σὺν also, which Croiset inserts elsewhere, is probably found nowhere in Menander, except in such a stock phrase as σὺν θεοῖς. In the line immediately before this (510) he is satisfied with τὸν φίλτατον καὶ τὸν γλυκύτατον παῖδ' ἐμόν, and actually writes a note on ἐμόν without seeing that its position in the absence of an article would need, to say the least of it, some defence.

But in spite of a few such errors the book will be found handy and pleasant. H. R.

*Early Greek Philosophy.* By Professor J. BURNET. London: A. & C. Black, 1908. 2nd ed. 12s. 6d. net.

THE first edition of this book appeared in 1892. It has been enlarged from 378 pp. to 433 pp., and the index is now much more complete. The writer says that he has not tried to amend the style; but in very many places the line of thought is brought out more clearly, either by a change of expression or else by the addition of a few sentences. Inaccurate or misleading statements are corrected, while the increased number of notes and quotations is not the least of the improvements in the new edition.

Professor Burnet now sees that the Greeks were not such spinners of theories as is often supposed. They understood thoroughly the importance of prolonged observation—and perhaps of experiment—before framing a hypothesis; owing to the defects of our tradition we often have only the results reached by the early Greek philosophers, without the preliminary study by which they were obtained. Professor Burnet would have found considerable support for this view in the writings of Hippocrates: the 'clinical histories' of the *Epidemics* are records of observations unsurpassed for care, accuracy and scientific precision. It is, however, pleasing to note that Professor Burnet does see the importance of paying more attention to the light thrown upon ancient philosophy by the history of medicine. The chapter, for instance, dealing with the Pythagoreans is nearly doubled in size. We now know, through the recent publication of extracts from the history of medicine known as Menon's *Iatrika*, that Philolaus wrote on medicine. Professor Burnet is of opinion, and it seems a correct one, that later Pythagoreanism differed from its earlier form because, as leaders of medical thought in Italy, the Pythagoreans were obliged to take 'elements' into account. The theory of 'elements,' alien from early Pythagorean thought, was forced upon the school by the study of medicine.

For the classical student, who is not yet acquainted with Greek philosophy, a better text-book could scarcely be found. It makes hard reading, but the advantages of mastering it are well worth the pains. Less brilliant and less suggestive than Gomperz, Professor Burnet does not (herein differing from many of his predecessors) presuppose a knowledge of the *data*. He gives translations of the philosophic fragments, and all who know the extreme difficulty of these will be grateful for the help and guidance thus afforded.

W. H. S. J.

*Athenian White Lekythoi*, with outline drawing in glaze varnish on a white ground. By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907. Pp. 371. With 15 plates and 57 illustrations in text. 11" x 7½".

MR. FAIRBANKS has given a very interesting and useful account of one class of the Athenian white lekythi, those with drawing outlined in black or yellow lustrous pigment (oddly styled 'glaze varnish'); those with drawing in dull colour are reserved for a possible second volume. The examples described cover the period 475–430 B.C., and number some 430 in all. They are classified in four groups according to the method of drawing, as set forth in a table which occupies the unusual position of frontispiece; each class contains about a hundred examples. Every specimen is fully described, and the plates are well executed; there is also a useful synopsis of subjects on p. 337. The indices are complete and satisfactory, but a table of contents is badly needed, as the head-lines do not help the reader sufficiently. It may be noted that *γάγκος* (p. 76) is a *vox nihili*, at least in the sense of a woman's head-dress; also that the genuineness of the inscription on p. 77 has been doubted.

H. B. W.

*Virgil's Epische Technik.* Von RICHARD HEINZE. B. G. Teubner, 1908. Zweite Auflage. Pp. 498.

THE first edition of this work was published in 1902. On the appearance of a second



edition it may be useful to recall the general character of an important book. The author's object is to arrive at an understanding of the processes which brought the *Aeneid* into being. His pages do not deal at all with the style or versification of the *Aeneid*, matters of much moment for the general effect produced by the poem, but not for the understanding of it as a work of the epic poet's art. The chief object is to reveal the artistical tendencies of the *Aeneid* by means of an examination of the *Aeneid* itself. The book is in two parts, the first comprising an analysis of the larger con-

nected divisions of the *Aeneid* in the matter of technique. The object here is to determine what the poet found in his sources, and what he borrowed from his models, and on this ground to track down his transforming and creative activities. In the second part the results so attained are put together, and an attempt is made to offer a complete and systematic idea of epic technique. The second edition is slightly modified in accordance with the views expressed by Norden in his commentary on *Aeneid* VI.

S. E. WINBOLT.

## NEWS AND COMMENTS

### THE 'ELECTRA.'

THE *Electra* of Sophocles in Greek was given on July 15, 16, and 17 in the Court Theatre. After all needful deductions are made, for cramped stage and for the unavoidable imperfections of amateurs, the play as a whole was very well done. By its effect even on those who could not follow the ancient tongue and had beforehand a very imperfect notion of the plot, the work of Sophocles once more demonstrated its power as a finely constructed and great tragedy. If the antique atmosphere is sometimes a bar to perfect sympathy in reading, *ὄψις* breaks through all that, and the universal humanity of it reaches the heart. And this in spite of imperfections of rendering. The little stage allows no room for a proper *ὀρχήστρα*. Perhaps one may mention also, in the present widespread interest in an improved pronunciation of Greek and Latin, that vowel quantities and doubled consonants were often quite indistinct, the rhythm of lyric parts not always clear. It is a pity, too, that *γν* should have been spoken like *gn* in German, for which there is really no evidence, and that *ζ* should have been sounded as *sd* or *zd*, the evidence for which is greatly outweighed by the evidence for *dz*.

The musical accompaniment, for harp and wood-wind mainly, was composed by Mr. Bantock, Professor of Music in the Uni-

versity of Birmingham, and was simple but effective. Without seeming thin, it afforded a better hint of how the ancient combination may have sounded than any other which the present writer has heard. The exceedingly difficult part of *Electra* was admirably done by Miss E. L. Calkin; Clytaemnestra by Miss Strudwick was also good; the others were adequate; the death scene was thrillingly rendered. The chorus, by the grace of their movements, in spite of the narrow space available, presented a series of exquisite pictures which two American spectators at least will long remember.

G.

EUROPEAN scholars may be interested to hear how the pioneer work of classical study is done *in partibus*. Prof. H. D. Naylor, of Adelaide, has been lecturing in Perth to crowded audiences, on the Platonic Socrates; and he had a good house even at Kilgourlie on the Gold Fields. The Greeks of Perth, ever ready as Greeks are to respond to a national appeal, entertained Mr. Naylor at a dinner and expressed their sympathy with his efforts. Our readers know that Greek is a dead language at the antipodes; perhaps it would be more correct to say that it has not yet come to life.

In South Africa, Miss M. V. Williams has lectured to the Classical Association on Reformed methods of teaching Latin and Greek.

THE longest papers in the July *Quarterly* are Mr. W. Scott's on the difficult chorus in the *Helena*, 1301 sqq., with an appendix criticizing Mr. Verrall's theory of the play, and Mr. Rice Holmes's examination of Sign. Ferrero's views upon Caesar's *First Commentary*. Mr. Winstedt writes on some curious Coptic legends about Roman emperors, Mr. Cornford on Plato, *Phaedo* 105 A, and Mr. G. B. Hussey on χρυσοχοεῖν in *Rep.* 450 B. Mr. Kronenberg has critical notes on Epictetus and Mr. Cook Wilson one upon Clement.

Mr. Summers completes his textual annotations on Seneca's Letters. Mr. T. W. Allen reviews Agar's *Homericæ* at length, and Mr. Stuart Jones two important catalogues of Italian Museums. There are shorter notices, of Wenger's *Legal Representation in Papyri* by Mr. A. S. Hunt, and of Prentice's *Inscriptions from Syria* by the editor of this Journal.

THE Editor wishes to say that the letter on page 142 signed S. should have been signed Σ.

## TRANSLATION

(THEOGNIS A. 69-86.)

Μήποτε, Κύρνε, κακῷ πίσυνος βούλευε σὺν  
ἀνδρί,  
εὖτ' ἂν σπουδαῖον πρήγμ' ἐθέλῃς τελέσαι,

ἀλλὰ μετ' ἐσθλὸν ἰὼν βούλευε καὶ πολλὰ  
μογῆσαι  
καὶ μακρὴν πουςίν, Κύρν', ὅδδ' ἐκτελέσαι.  
Πρήξειν μὴδὲ φίλοισιν ὅλως ἀνακοῖνεο πᾶσι·  
παῦροί τοι πολλῶν πιστὸν ἔχουσι νόον.

Παύροισιν πίσυνος μεγαλ' ἀνδράσιν ἔργ' ἐπι-  
χείρει,  
μή ποτ' ἀνήκεστον, Κύρνε, λάβῃς ἀνίην.

Πιστὸς ἀνὴρ χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἀντερύ-  
σασθαι

ἄξιος ἐν χαλεπῇ, Κύρνε, διχουστασίῃ.  
Παύρους εὐρήσεις, Πολιπαιδῆ, ἄνδρας ἐταί-  
ρους  
πιστοὺς ἐν χαλεποῖς πρήγμασι γινομένους,  
οἵτινες ἂν τολμῶεν ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες  
ἴσόν τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν τε κακῶν μετέχειν.  
Τούτους οὐχ εὐροῖς διζήμενος οὐδ' ἐπὶ πάντας  
ἀνθρώπους, οὓς ναῦς μὴ μία πάντας ἄγοι,

οἷσιν ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ τε καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἔπεστιν  
αἰδώς, οὐδ' αἰσχρὸν χρῆμ' ἐπὶ κέρδος ἄγει.

1. My son, take thou never counsel with the wicked,  
Neither put thou thy trust in him when thou wouldest bring any worthy thing to pass :
2. But find thee out an upright man :  
Yea, even with long toil and far wandering shalt thou seek him.
3. Commit not thy way utterly unto any man, no, not unto thy friends,  
For there be few that are of an honest heart.
4. When thou art about a great matter put not confidence in many,  
Lest a grievous mischief come upon thee thereby.
5. Verily a sure man is precious :  
In the needful time of distress he is beyond silver and gold.
6. Not many shalt thou find faithful of them that company with thee,  
Men that would endure to be of one mind with thee and to share thy evil fortune as thy-good.
7. Make diligent search for such even in all lands,  
But thou shalt not find them :
8. Yea, one ship might bear all them upon whose tongue and in whose eyes dwelleth righteousness,  
Who take no evil thing in hand for advantage.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

*The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.*

\* \* *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Abbott (Edwin A.) *The Message of the Son of Man.* 9" x 5 3/4". Pp. xxii + 166. London, Adam & Charles Black. 1909. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Appel (Georgius) *De Romanorum precationibus. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Band VII. Heft 2.)* 9" x 6". Pp. 222. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann. 1909. M. 7.
- Aristophanes. *Aristophanis Cantica, digessit stropharum popularium appendiculam adjecit Otto Schroeder. (Bibl. Script. Gr. et. Rom. Teub.)* 7 1/2" x 4 3/4". Pp. viii + 100. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 2.40; geb. in Leinwand, M. 2.80.
- Aristophanis Pax, edidit Konradus Zacher. Prefatus est Ottomarus Bachmann. 9 1/2" x 6". Pp. xxxiii + 128. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 5.
- Caser (Paul) *Die Kunst des Übersetzen. Ein Hilfsbuch für den lateinischen und griechischen Unterricht. Vierte, vielfach verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage.* 8 1/2" x 5 1/2". Pp. viii + 168. Berlin, Weidman. 1909. geb. in Leinwand, M. 4.
- Classical Weekly, The.* Published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Edited by Gonzalez Lodge. Vols. I. and II. 10 1/2" x 8". Pp. iv + 232, iv + 248. New York. 1908, 1909. 1 dollar a year.
- Commentationes Philologae Jenensae ediderunt Seminarium Philologorum Jenensis Professores.* Vol. VIII. Fasc. posterior. 9 1/2" x 5 3/8". Pp. 184. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 8.
- Dähnhardt (Oskar) *Natursagen. Eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden. Band II. Sagen zum neuen Testament.* 10" x 6 3/8". Pp. xvi + 316. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 8; geb. M. 10.50.
- De Stoop (E.) *Essai sur la diffusion de Manichéisme dans l'empire Romain.* 9 1/2" x 6 1/4". Pp. viii + 152. Gand, van Goethem. 1909.
- Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele. Herausgegeben von Paul Hinneberg. Teil I. Abt. 5. Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, von Wilhelm Wundt, Hermann Oldenberg, Ignaz Goldziher, Wilhelm Grube, Tetsujiro Inouye, Hans von Arnim, Clemens Baumer, Wilhelm Windelband.* 10 1/2" x 7 1/4". Pp. viii + 572. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 12; geb. M. 14.
- Domaszewski (Alfred von) *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion.* 9 1/2" x 6". Pp. viii + 240, mit 26 Abb. im Text und einer Tafel. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 6; geb. in Leinwand, M. 7.
- Duff (J. Wight) *A Literary History of Rome, from the Origenes to the Close of the Golden Age.* 9" x 6". Pp. xvi + 696. T. Fisher Unwin. 1909. 12s. 6d. net.
- Eger (Dr. Jur. Otto) *Zur ägyptischen Grundbuchwesen in römischer Zeit. Untersuchungen auf Grund der griechischen Papyri.* 9 1/2" x 6 1/4". Pp. viii + 212. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 7; geb. in Leinwand, M. 8.
- Euripides. *The Phoenissae. Edited by A. C. Pearson, M.A. (Pitt Press Series.)* 6 3/8" x 4 3/8". Pp. 1 (50) + 246. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth, 4s.
- Friedländer (Ludwig) *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire; by Ludwig Friedländer. Authorized translation of the Seventh enlarged and revised edition of the Sittengeschichte Roms, by J. H. Freese, M.A. (Camb.) and Leonard A. Magnus, LL.B. In three volumes. Vol. II.* 8" x 5". Pp. xviii + 366. London, George Routledge. 1909. Cloth, 6s.
- Gaffiot (Félix) *Pour le vrai latin. I.* 10" x 6 1/2". Pp. 174. Paris, Ernest Leroux. 1909.
- Harry (J. E.) *Studies in Euripides: Hippolytus. University Studies, published by the University of Cincinnati. Series II. Vol. iv. No. 4. Nov.-Dec., 1908.* Pp. 72. University Press, Cincinnati.
- Hartmann (Nicolai) *Platos Logik des Seins. (Philosophische Arbeiten, herausgegeben von Hermann Cohen und Paul Natorp. Band III.)* 9" x 6 1/4". Pp. x + 518. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann. 1909. M. 15.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vol. XX. 1909. 9" x 5 3/8" Pp. 174. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.; London, Longmans, Green, & Co.; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz. 1909. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.
- Hellenica Oxyrhynchia cum Theopompi et Cratippi Fragmentis. Recognoverunt brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt B. P. Grenfell et A. S. Hunt. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.)* 7 1/2" x 5". Pp. viii + 172(?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Paper, 4s.; cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Hirschy (N. C.) *Artaxerxes III. Ochus and his reign, with special consideration of the O.T. sources. (Doctor's Dissertation.)* 10" x 6 3/8". Pp. 86. Chicago, University Press. 1909. Cl. 81 cents post free.
- Jebb (Sir R. C.) *Samson Agonistes and the Hellenic Drama. By the late Sir R. C. Jebb, O.M. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. II.)* 9 3/8" x 6 1/4". Pp. 8. London, Henry Frowde. 1909. 1s. net.

- Lösch** (Stephan) Die Einsiedler Gedichte. Eine literar-historische Untersuchung. Inaugural-Dissertation. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 88, mit 1 tafel. Tübingen, J. J. Hechenhauer. 1909.
- Lucanus.** Adnotationes super Lucanum, primum ad vetustissimorum codicum fidem edidit Joannes Endt. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 448. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 8; geb. in Leinwand, M. 8.60.
- Maccari** (L.) La Perikeiromene di Menandro. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 8". Pp. 44. Trani, Vecchi e C. 1909.
- Macchioro** (Vittorio) Il Simbolismo nelle figurazioni sepolcrali romane. Studi di Ermeneutica. Memoria letta alla R. Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9". Pp. 144. Napoli, Achille Cimmaruta. 1909.
- Marquand** (Allan) Greek Architecture. (*Handbooks of Archeology and Antiquities.*) 8" x 5". Pp. x + 426, with 392 illustrations. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Nelson** (Axel) Die Hippokratische Schrift περί φρωσών. Text und Studien. Inaugural-Dissertation. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 120. Upsala, Almqvist und Wiksell. 1909.
- P. Papini Stati Silvae.** Varietatem lectionis selectam exhibuit Gregorius Saenger. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 232. Petropoli, ex Officina Senatus. 1909.
- Philostratos über Gymnastik.** Von Julius Jüthner. (*Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern.*) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 336. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 10; geb. in Leinwand, M. 11.
- Poland** (Franz) Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens. (*Preischriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der Fürstlichen Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. XXXVIII. Nr. xxiii der historisch-nationalökonomischen Sektion.*) 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 656. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 24.
- Preuschen** (Dr. Erwin) Vollständiges Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Lieferung 4. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 241-320 (Columns 481-640). Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann. 1909. M. 1.80.
- Rodenwaldt** (Gerhart) Die Komposition der pompejanischen Wandgemälde. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 270. Berlin, Weidmann. 1909. M. 9.
- Sanctis** (Gaetano De) Per la Scienza dell' Antichità. Saggi e Polemiche. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xii + 532. Torino, Fratelli Bocca. 1909. Lire 6.
- Schwarstein** (Albert). Eine Gebäudegruppe in Olympia. (*Zur Kunstgeschichte des Auslandes. Heft 66.*) 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 8". Pp. 42, mit 5 Tafeln. Strassburg, J. H. Ed. Heitz. 1909. M. 3.50.
- Scott** (J. A.) Studies in Greek Sigmation. Reprint from a periodical unspecified, pp. 69-77, 72-77. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Evanston, Illinois. 1909. Cl.
- Seneca.** De Otio. Édition accompagnée de notes critiques et d'un commentaire explicatif, par René Waltz. 9 $\frac{7}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 38. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1909. Fr. 3.
- Sophocles.** The Trachinian Maidens of Sophocles. Translated into English verse, by Hugo Sharpley, M.A. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 68. London, David Nutt. 1909. 1s. 6d. net.
- Sudhaus** (S.) Der Aufbau der plautinischen Cantica. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 154. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 5; geb. in Leinwand, M. 6.
- Tacitus.** The Agricola. With introduction and notes by Duane Reed Stuart. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxviii + 112. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Cloth, 40 c.
- Tambornino** (Julius) De antiquorum daemonismo. (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Band VII. Heft 3.*) 9" x 6". Pp. 112. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann. 1909. M. 3.40.
- Thackeray** (Henry St. John) A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. I. Introduction, orthography and accidence. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xx + 326. Cambridge, University Press. 1909. Cloth, 8s. net.
- Thain** (Leslie) Timotheus and other Poema. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 42. Hereford, Jakeman & Carver. 1909.
- Theophrasti Characteres recensuit Hermannus Diels.** (*Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.*) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xxviii + 68 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1909. Paper, 3s.; Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Thucydides.** Book III. Edited by E. C. Marchant, M.A. 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 4". Pp. xlii + 226. London, Macmillan & Co. 1909. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Tissier** (Jean) Table Analytique des Articles du Journal des Savants, 1859-1908. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 62. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1909.
- Weinreich** (Otto). Antike Heilungswunder. Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer. (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Band VIII. Heft 1.*) 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 212. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann. 1909. M. 7.
- Zeller** (Franz X.) Die Zeit Kommodians. Inaugural-Dissertation. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. x + 161-408. Tübingen, H. Laupp, Jr. 1909.
- Ziebarth** (Erich) Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 150. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. geh. M. 4; geb. in Leinwand, M. 5.
- Zimmermann** (Johannes) Luciani quae feruntur podagra et ocypos. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. xii + 82. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1909. geh. M. 3; geb. in Leinwand, M. 4.

## ERRATA.

P. 99, 2nd col., line 4, for 'Analecta' read 'Anthologia.'

P. 135, 2nd col., line 6 from end, for 'second person' read 'third person.'